DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 300 836 CS 211 597

AUTHOR Sneed, Jean Heinze
TITLE The Teaching of Revision: Case Studies of Three Eighth Grade Language Arts Teachers.
PUB DATE Oct 88
NOTE 203p.; Ed.D. Dissertation, National College of Education.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Doctoral Dissertations (041) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Classroom Research; Grade 8; Junior High Schools; Naturalistic Observation; Process Education; *Revision (Written Composition); Teacher Attitudes; *Theory Practice Relationship; *Writing Instruction; Writing Processes; Writing Research
IDENTIFIERS Writing Attitudes

ABSTRACT

Observing the teaching of revision from the teacher's perspective, a study conducted case studies of three eighth grade language arts teachers who taught writing by a process approach, but who used different instructional techniques, comparing what each teacher believed and said about the revision stage with how she actually taught the process. The study used a qualitative research design, with data from in-depth teacher interviews and classroom observations supplemented by tapes of all conversations, observations and interviews, work written by students, and work sheets and other materials handed out by the teachers. The teachers observed were all from suburban school districts near a large midwestern city, and were recommended by writing professors who had conducted workshops in the teachers' school districts and by curriculum directors who had worked with teachers interested in writing instruction. Classroom observations were conducted on the average of four days a week, from October to the end of March. Findings indicated that teachers could be successful in teaching revision if they use available techniques, which can be reinforced by individual conferences, group sharing, team editing, and peer conferences. Findings also suggested that teacher attitudes and classroom roles had a great deal to do with how writing is taught and learned. (Two figures, five appendixes--including interview questions, teacher handouts, and other collected data--and 70 references are attached.) (MM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED300836

THE TEACHING OF REVISION: CASE STUDIES OF THREE EIGHTH GRADE LANGUAGE ARTS TEACHERS

by

Jean Heinze Sneed

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE:

Kenneth J. Kantor
Co-Chairperson

Harvey A. Daniels
Co-Chairperson

Judith Christenson
Member

APPROVED:

Kenneth J. Kantor
Advisor

Rebecca Barr
Associate Dean of Doctoral Studies

Darrell Bloom
Dean of Graduate School

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jean H. Sneed

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CS211597

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE TEACHING OF REVISION: CASE STUDIES OF THREE EIGHTH GRADE LANGUAGE ARTS TEACHERS

by

Jean Heinze Sneed

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Doctor of Education in the
Graduate School
National College of Education
October, 1988

ABSTRACT

Case studies of three eighth grade language arts teachers who taught writing by a process approach compared what each teacher believed and said about the revision stage of writing with how each actually taught the process. The first teacher, a traditionally oriented instructor, used literary selections as a way of launching the writing activities in her classroom. She felt that revision was the most difficult but also was the most important aspect of the process. Her actual teaching tended to emphasize proofreading. The second teacher had tried using the techniques of Donald Graves with success and wished to add elements of Nancie Atwell's model. She also felt revision was the most important stage of the writing process, but later admitted she was uncertain as to how to teach it. Her students received mixed signals on the importance of the writing process as a whole, even though she included revision techniques in her teaching repertoire. The third teacher was attempting to implement the Atwell model as an experiment for a Master's degree project. She too believed that revision was the most important part of the writing process and made extensive use of Atwell's suggestions for teaching revision. The results showed that her students improved their writing, seemed to revise automatically as they wrote, and made revision a natural part of their writing process.

Findings indicate that teachers can be successful in teaching revision if they use available techniques, which can be reinforced by individual conferences, group sharing, team editing, and peer conferences. Implications of these findings point to the need for teacher education and inservice programs to stress revision in writing.

creating a classroom climate conducive to writing, and following through on instruction both individually and in groups. There is need to teach writing and revision at all levels and across subject areas. Additionally, this study suggests that the teacher's attitudes and classroom roles have a great deal to do with how writing is taught and learned.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

For the most part teachers are a dedicated group who want to teach children to the best of their ability, or they would not have chosen the profession in the first place. The teachers I observed for this study were hard working and sincere in their efforts to teach writing and revision effectively. They wanted to succeed, not only for themselves but for the students involved. It was a pleasure to watch these efforts unfold, and I feel the time I spent in observation was a highlight of the study. I couldn't possibly thank these three teachers enough for inviting me into their classrooms and for sharing their daily experiences with me. It became an enjoyable time to remember.

I am also especially grateful to Dr. Kenneth Kantor for all his help in guiding the research and the study. His patience seemed endless. The doctoral committee, led by Dr. Kantor and Dr. Harvey "Smokey" Daniels as co-chairpersons, also included Dr. Judith Christensen. Each meeting was meaningful; each member contributed so much to the progress of this study that the final oral defense actually became a most positive experience for me.

Last, but not least, I want to thank my family--my son, John Heinze, my daughter-in-law Vicki, and my daughter, Ann Heinze--who always support my every effort and cheer me on. To my husband, Albert M. Sneed, a very special award is due, for he champions my causes and helps me in every possible way to make them all come true.

Jean Heinze Sneed
October, 1988

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
LIST OF FIGURES	viii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose	1
Background	3
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	7
Introduction	7
What Is Involved in the Act of Writing	7
Prewriting or Planning	10
The Theory of Schema	10
Prior Knowledge and Experience	12
Other Strategies in Composing	13
Writing	17
Use of Imagination	17
Development of Inner Speech and Writing Intuitions	18
Apprehension	20
Conclusions	22
Research on Written Composition	24
Revision	28
Empirical Research on What Students Do When They Revise	29
Empirical Research on Teacher Attitude	41
Empirical Research on Written Instruction	45

Page

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN..... 47

Population and Sampling..... 50

Research Procedures..... 52

Coding for Fieldnotes..... 56

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS..... 60

Introduction..... 61

Profile of an Eighth Grade Language Arts Teacher of Writing--Carol..... 68

Student Response and Perceptions..... 77

Profile of an Eighth Grade Language Arts Teacher of Writing--Linda..... 79

Student Response and Perceptions..... 85

Profile of an Eighth Grade Language Arts Teacher of Writing--Sarah..... 88

Student Response and Perceptions..... 98

Comparison of the Three Teachers..... 102

CHAPTER 5: IMPLICATIONS AND FINDINGS..... 109

A Limitation of the Study..... 117

Implications for Future Research..... 117

REFERENCES..... 119

APPENDIXES..... 127

Appendix A: Interviews

A-1: Pre-observation Interviews..... 127

A-2: Post Observation Interviews..... 131

Appendix B: Carol's Handouts

B-1: Introductory Sheet for Brainstorming on Story. 142

Page

B-2: Outline for Organizing Paragraphs..... 143

B-3: Editing Sheets for Students..... 144

B-4: Student Evaluation Sheets..... 146

B-5: Example of Anonymous Work Used for Class Editing..... 148

Appendix C: Linda's Handouts

C-1: Worksheets Used for the Descriptive Paragraph. 152

Appendix D: Sarah's Handouts

D-1: Student Reference Sheets..... 156

D-2: Narrative Evaluation Sheet..... 160

D-3: Lesson Plan..... 161

D-4: Sarah's Writing Survey..... 163

Appendix E: Collected Data

E-1: Observer's Log Entries..... 164

E-2: Tape Transcriptions..... 170

E-3: Data Reduction Chart..... 173

LIST OF FIQURES

Page

FIQURE 1: Data Sources..... 54

FIQURE 2: Comparison of Student Work Before and After Instruction..... 107

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE

The overall goal of this study was to examine three middle school classrooms of eighth graders for one specific aspect of the process writing approach--revision--and to observe this aspect from the teachers' perspective. According to Hillocks (1986a), Graves (1983), and Applebee (1986) the process used in writing should include some or all of these stages.

1. Planning--prewriting activities for a class
2. Monitoring--guiding or conferencing individuals
3. Drafting--writing down ideas
4. Revising--changing the order of ideas or reworking or redefining parts of the whole
5. Editing--making mechanical and grammatical changes.

The particular aspect to be examined in this study was revision. Most studies have concerned themselves with what makes a child a good writer. By contrast there is little research to show what a good teacher does to help students write well. Since many teachers do not include any kind of revision and editing activity when their students write, it is imperative that more be learned about what teachers do to help students learn the art of revision. Teachers tend to overlook this step in the writing process because they do not know how to teach it effectively, they do not feel there is enough time to devote to it, or because they do not feel it is important to teach it. Of all the stages

in the writing process, revision is probably the most neglected (Sommers, 1978).

The middle school was selected for this study because there has been little research at this level. By sixth, seventh, or eighth grade, a student should have been exposed to writing of all sorts, but opportunities for revising have probably been few. Because teachers tend to overlook the revision stage, it is difficult to find genuine efforts to teach this skill in the lower elementary grades, even with conscientious teachers. Middle school was a good place to begin to observe, to see if there was a link between what a teacher said and what was done, and to look at a teacher's view of the revision process. If a teacher does not feel revision is important, it is not likely to be taught. According to the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 15.9% of the junior high school students reporting never rewrote a paper before handing it in to a teacher; 36.7% sometimes did; and 46.4% said they usually did. When papers were returned, 19% said there were never any comments written by teachers on how to improve their writing; 47% said there were comments sometimes; and only 33.1% said there usually were comments.

The questions considered in the present study encompassed both major issues and minor concerns. The primary purposes were to explore what teachers believed about revision and what they did to help students learn to revise. The secondary purpose was to explore what students did when they revised. Since the main focus was on the teacher, the first questions related to how the teacher thought and to what she/he believed

about revision. The relationship between the beliefs expressed and actual practice in the classroom was explored as well.

1. How do teachers view the revision process? What purposes and value does it have for them and their students?

Because teachers sometimes believe one thing but teach another, the next questions pertain to what instruction actually looked like.

2. How do teachers help their students to make revisions and to learn to revise effectively? What kinds of classroom lessons, activities, or processes do teachers use to teach revision and how much time is allocated to it?
3. What is the relationship between what the teacher believes about revision and how he/she is teaching revision?

Lastly, I was curious about students and how they perceived the revision process as well as what they did when they revised. Students may also think one way but practice something else.

4. How do students perceive revision and what do they do when they revise? How do they perceive their teacher's approach to revision or the instruction they receive?
5. What are the implications of the findings of this study for teaching and teacher education in the area of writing?

BACKGROUND

In a Ford Foundation study in the mid-1970's, Donald Graves (1978) found that the problem in our schools was not that children wrote poorly but that they seldom wrote at all. On the average, students wrote one

day in ten, and most of the writing was done in the context of language arts requirements. Little writing was done in other areas.

There is no question that students should write. It is an ongoing reflection of student's developing understanding of ideas. Many writing teachers are beginning to believe the slogan "writing to learn" should replace "learning to write" because they believe there is a direct relationship between the student's development as a thinker and the discovery of meaning in the course of writing. The current belief is that writing lies at the center of learning, and this belief continues to grow as more research is done (Graves, 1978).

The question of instructional issues and how to teach writing then arises. We have a rich background in writing. Even as far back as the Greeks and Romans, teachers of effective writing and speaking elaborated a five-stage composing process that included three which are still used in teaching writing:

1. Invention, or finding ideas.
2. Arrangement, or putting ideas into persuasive order.
3. Style, or dressing the ideas in persuasive language (Gage, 1986).

In modern times, according to Arthur Applebee (1986), the traditional approach to writing instruction in American schools has been prescriptive and product-centered. Success in writing has been measured by the ability to incorporate the rules of grammar and usage and to imitate models of traditional form. Many grammar textbooks commonly used in classrooms today reflect this traditional approach.

As the writing crisis gained momentum in the 1970's and 1980's, many authorities tried new and varied approaches to writing instruction. Instead of the traditional product orientation there was a groundswell of support for "process approaches" to learning to write. Exactly what process approaches mean in classrooms varies from teacher to teacher. In general, they are marked by instructional activities designed to help students think through and organize their ideas before writing and to rethink and revise their initial drafts.

These process approaches have become the conventional wisdom, at least among leaders in the teaching of English. During the early 1970's these approaches were enthusiastically received because they focused on the child during a generally child-centered era. They continued in favor during the writing crisis because it was thought they fostered higher order reasoning skills. They seemed to be an apparent avenue of reform when reform was clearly needed (Applebee, 1986).

As process-oriented writing instruction has become more widely accepted, research and knowledge have increased so that one can now stand back to assess the strengths and weaknesses of process approaches. The process-oriented approaches are really an oddity in education--a clear instance of research driving practice. From the multitude of research studies, general findings have emerged that show that writing involves a number of subprocesses that operate recursively rather than in a straight, linear sequence. These subprocesses include planning, monitoring, drafting, revising, and editing (Hillocks, 1986a).

Process approaches now dominate the professional literature on the teaching of writing. But the practical aspects of the students'

learning to write still show little writing being done in schools. Writing that is done typically reinforces plunging straight in, with no prewriting activities, no revision, no broader audience, no editing sessions.

Some experts say the implementation of process approaches has not been very successful. Process instruction takes time which comes at the expense of other activities. Yet Applebee (1986) views the problems of process approaches as part of the difficulty in developing any new instructional paradigm, rather than a call for a return to older patterns of instruction. He views the process approaches to writing as beneficial and feels they have many advantages over traditional programs. However, these advantages will be lost if they cannot be incorporated into instructional programs.

Much research has been done in the area of writing and on the process of revision in particular. In the next chapter a review of the research literature is provided.

CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

An important part of the writing process is revision, even though it is a neglected stage of that process. Writing and revision are actually inseparable, for one cannot write without revising. When one attempts to write, it is an automatic response to check for meaning and clarity either as one writes or at the close. The purpose of this study was to view revision as a part of the writing process but to do so meant to view the process in its entirety, since revision cannot be examined in isolation.

WHAT IS INVOLVED IN THE ACT OF WRITING

The decade of the 1970's brought a surge of interest in writing and the writing process. Many studies were concerned with what might best be called production activity, since researchers set out to determine what was actually involved in the act of writing. This new kind of research was given impetus in 1971 when Janet Emig set out to investigate the nature of the composing processes of twelfth graders. It was the first non-instructional attempt to research the composing process. It suggested new ways of describing the behaviors of writers as well as new methods of research needed to investigate activities with composing. Using the three stages of Rohman and Wlecke (1964) of prewriting, writing, and rewriting, Emig (1971) focused on the study of process and person instead of product, which widened her findings. This

study became a model for current research. Because of Emig's work there has been a shift from concern for the written product to a more enlightened view of composing as a complex process consisting of a series of behaviors that are affected by many interwoven factors.

In 1973 a dissertation study by Donald Graves greatly contributed to the increased interest in writing research by exemplifying the case study method to explore the writing process with seven-year-old children. According to Graves, a single writing episode consisted of three phases of observation: prewriting, composing, and postwriting. His findings led to conclusions about learning environments, sex differences in writing, and developmental factors, and the impact of all of them on the writing process.

Charles Stallard (1974) followed Emig's lead in observing the writing behavior of good student writers in the twelfth grade. He compared these students with a randomly selected writer group with behaviors exclusive to good writers. He used prewriting, writing, and revision as a way of categorizing the observations he made. He concluded he had been able to examine the actual process of composing and suggested the significance of the cognitive processes involved. He felt writing might be in itself an act of perception and conceptualization and that writers had a need to experience what was evolving as they wrote.

Terry Mischel (1974) also examined student composing using a case study of a twelfth grader. In his observations he saw students mentally do the prewriting or planning stage before they even started to write. They seemed to conceive in "whole" for small, manageable topics taking a

short period of time. The composing or the writing phase depended on the purpose for which it was written. Self-sponsored or assigned writing was approached differently by the students. Reformulating or revision was done in varying degrees. From his observations Mischel concluded that many students reject the conception of English as a content subject, that many traditional models used are fragmentary, mechanized and irrelevant, and that much English instruction for writing is concerned with "shallow mechanical activities." "The relationship of language to personal growth and the inner ordering of experience is sadly neglected" (p. 314), he concluded.

These early studies contributed to a growing body of data concerning developmental differences. The role of conceptual knowledge, or schemata, for content and form became research concerns as well.

From looking at the many and varied studies I found generally that the writing process could be defined as "a series of operations leading to the solution of a problem. The process begins when the writer consciously or unconsciously starts a topic and is finished when the written piece is published" (Graves, 1981). Researchers generally agreed that writing involved a number of recursively operating subprocesses rather than a linear sequence. These subprocesses include planning or prewriting, writing, and revising. They provide a new way of thinking about writing in terms of what the writer does instead of what the final product looks like. Let us examine now each of these subprocesses of the three-stage writing process.

PREWRITING OR PREPLANNING

The first phase of the writing process is planning. It has been defined as the period of time between the moment the assignment is received and the time writing begins (Hillocks, 1986a). What influences planning and what thinking processes a writer goes through before writing have been a source of conjecture. This has led to attempts to link research in the theories of schema, prior knowledge and experience, and other strategies, both cognitive and developmental, used in composing, to see how planning for composing is done.

The Theory of Schema

The underlying mental process in composing has become a source of investigation. Recent developmental research supports the view that competence in written composition does not consist merely of special knowledge and skill added to oral language. The cognitive approach to composing recognizes schema theory as put forth by D. E. Rumelhart (1980). Schema theory is a theory about knowledge and how knowledge is represented and used. According to this theory, all knowledge is packaged into units which are called schemata. Embedded in these packets of knowledge is information about how this knowledge is to be used.

Schema theorists have differed in their exact terminology and definitions. S. K. Reed (1982) noted the term schema itself is based on the work of Kant (1787) and Bartlett (1932) and is used by Rumelhart because of its historical significance. Schemata, the plural form of the term, are considered the building blocks of cognition by cognitive

theorists. They are considered the fundamental elements upon which all information processing depends. They are employed in the process of interpreting sensory data, in retrieving information from memory, in organizing actions, in determining goals and subgoals, in allocating resources, and in guiding the flow of processing in the system. Schemata play a central role in all of our reasoning processes. Most of our reasoning ability, apparently, is tied to particular schemata related to particular bodies of knowledge. Schemata are also assumed to be the guiding forces behind remembering, inferencing, comprehending, perceiving, and predicting as well. Much research is being done to bring to this theory greater understanding of schemata, for a definite explanation does not yet exist, and there are skeptics who view this theory with suspicion. To use this theory as a "cognitive approach" to writing instruction is the hope of those working on it, for it might mean a way of teaching expert composing processes to novices. Research may also contribute to the teaching of writing by improving existing approaches, by suggesting new or more clearly specified instructional goals, and by providing a more powerful conceptual basis for planning writing instruction (Scardamalia and Bereiter, 1986).

Reed (1982) also noted that Rumelhart and Ortony (1977) explained that schemata form hierarchical trees, with branches activated by the current situation and related to existing memory. From this perspective, schema theory suggests a linear view of writing, for writing could be seen as sequential steps corresponding to the sequential activation of various schemata (Bruton, 1985). This would involve strict adherence to schema theory. This linear view, however,

is a weakness of schema theory. Emig (1971), Graves (1974), Mischel (1974), Stallard (1974), Sommers (1980), and others have suggested that writing is recursive in nature, not linear. But schema theory does provide a cognitively-based interpretation for ways in which the writer shapes and discovers meaning during the composing act (Bruton, 1985). This perspective, however, is not consistent with current research which suggests the importance of planning in composing (Flower and Hayes, 1981; Matsuhashi, 1981) by the writer's train of thought and in-process discoveries or perceptions (Bruton, 1985; Emig, 1971; and Murray, 1982).

Prior Knowledge and Experience

According to Reed (1982), prior knowledge influences either the comprehension of ideas or the retrieval of information from memory. He compared the term "scripts" as put forth by Schank and Abelson (1977) to Rumelhart's schema because knowledge, he claimed, is organized around many kinds of routine activities--for example, going to a restaurant, visiting a doctor, or riding in a car. A restaurant script would specify what we know about going to a restaurant, representing prior knowledge. All the things we associate with restaurants become part of a set standard that represents prior knowledge when someone asks us a question about restaurants. Such knowledge will help to determine what is to be emphasized as we write and provides a framework for comprehension and recalling ideas. It can make abstract ideas seem less abstract and easier to understand. Any student who lacks appropriate prior knowledge about writing conventions and/or a specific topic may experience difficulty in writing.

As yet, however, prior knowledge in the sense of cognitive development is only an assumption. It is conceivable, according to Scardamalia and Bereiter (1986), that research on the composing process will lead to a coherent "cognitive approach" to writing instruction. Such an approach really does not exist at present, however, and it is not necessarily a desirable eventuality if it means yet another approach to be put into competition with existing ones.

Writing is a cognitive act. Of that there can be no doubt. The writer's knowledge is the key to any act of planning and composing. But there are other aspects of this process that remain unexplained by a cognitive approach. Imagination, intuition, apprehension, language fluency, and our inner voice all play a part in how we plan and what we write.

Other Strategies in Composing

Linda Flower and John Hayes (1981) explored the workings of a writer's mind by having writers compose aloud. These studies were limited by how much the writers were able to articulate, but the nature of the cognitive activity of the writers as they generated or planned ideas and transformed them into written text gave clues to the composing process.

The strength of the Flower and Hayes model lies in its claim to account for an amazing diversity of mental events during composition on the basis of a relatively small number of subprocesses. Any subprocess can incorporate any other subprocess so that, for example, the whole planning process may be called up for purposes of editing, or the

reviewing process may be used to arrive at an organizing decision. This property is called recursion and is one of the important differences between the process and product orientations to writing.

According to Flower and Hayes (1981), the first main type of planning occurs to generate ideas. This type of planning may consist of procedural plans which instruct how to go about the process of writing. These plans establish priorities and focus for higher level goals, which in turn generate ideas. They continue to work by (a) pursuing an interesting idea plan as it develops through sub-plans and which acts as a spring board for more complex ideas, (b) "thinking by conflict," which is the active seeking of objections, contradictions or questions in order to clarify ideas, (c) "saying what I really mean" which consists of condensing complex ideas into useful features, and (d) "finding a focus" or a main idea. Once a focus has been determined, not only do the writers continue to generate ideas, but they also begin to turn them into a paper.

The second type of planning--for producing a paper--will begin to direct the writer's decisions. These are goal-directed plans consisting of (a) "forming for use," or deciding what to use and how to use it; (b) "organizing," or placing ideas in relation to sequence and significance; (c) "reader-based plans," or strategies to meet the needs of the audience; and (d) "product-based plans," or concerns about the finished product. In planning there may be some confusion about the topic when writers are under pressure to produce a product, and they may switch from one plan to another or combine several.

Flower and Hayes (1981) in addressing the nature of planning concluded that not only does planning go on at many levels, but writers appear to work in composing "episodes" or units of concentration which are organized around a goal or plan. There is good reason to think that some of the crucial differences between good and poor writers lie in the kind of quality of goals writers give themselves and in their ability to use this planning to guide their own composing.

In a far reaching study of the reading and composing behavior of fourth and seventh graders, June Birnbaum (1982) viewed the prewriting activity as the time when students display mental and physical behaviors such as searching for a topic and mode, elaborating ideas, planning a major segment of the text, or exhibiting avoidance behavior--making irrelevant comments or becoming distracted. She concluded that the most proficient writers pause longer to deliberate over topics, related ideas, and possible organizations to represent their meanings to an audience. They form a plan which they regard as tentative and subject to revision. Their thinking involves both analysis and synthesis, and they display various concerns over overall meaning, evaluation of what they are planning, and if it would achieve its purpose.

Allen Glatthorn (1982) argues that writing begins with an exploring stage, but the exploring continues well into the drafting stage. As we write, we get new ideas, reconsider the approach, and re-think our stance. When we write, the planning process continues well into the drafting stage. Skilled writers, however, compose differently than do unskilled writers. Skilled writers take time to explore and plan and use a variety of planning techniques and forms such as listing,

sketching, and diagramming. Unskilled writers do very little planning either before they write or as they write.

Although what happens in the prewriting period is more important than the length of time involved, other studies indicate student writers do very little prewriting or planning. Sondra Perl (1979) observed that students begin writing within the first few minutes. Although some students are able to work the topic into something they could begin to write about, frequently students indicate they have "no idea" what to write and start to write without any true sense of where they are heading. They plan to "figure it out" as they go along. Writing, therefore, leads to planning which leads to clarifying which leads to more writing. This sequence of planning and writing, clarifying and discarding, is repeated frequently.

Ann Matsuhashi (1981) suggests that writers often seem to have some kind of generalized plan in mind when they begin. At the point of inscription writers continually make decisions, pushing the text forward, evaluating the plan for the text, revising the plan, or altering the plan. Shaping--but not revising--at the point of inscription is a key phrase Matsuhashi uses to suggest that cognitive processes during writing are flexible and that writing is produced as it is organized, in response to goals (Matsuhashi, 1982). Frank Smith (1981) asserts that much of what is written involves a whole lifetime of preparation--of experiencing, reading, reflecting, and arguing. Many relevant ideas come to us when we are not thinking specifically about what we propose to write.

Writing itself can be prewriting, for as we draft one part of a text we may reflect upon what we might write next or upon that already written. The act of writing does not break itself down into neatly identifiable, manageable steps. It is woven into part of our existence.

WRITING

The second phase of the writing process is the actual composing. Graves (1983) describes this process as a "series of operations leading to the solution of a problem. The process begins when the writer consciously or unconsciously starts a topic and is finished when the written piece is published" (p. 234). These operations may include the use of imagination, development of writing intuition and inner speech, and apprehension about what to say and how to say it. An affective approach might consider all of them.

Use of Imagination

Imagination can be defined as creative ability or the power to form the mental image of something not present to the senses. Those who are proponents of the role of imagination in writing believe that only by relying on the imagination can the writer bring out the beauty of language in writing and use the power of language for expressing thought. Murray (1982), for example, believes that imagination promotes motivation and that writing creates its own power through the ability to help writers discover and create meaning for themselves. Beyond logic and reasoning, feelings and emotions trigger the flow of imaginative language. The key to writing is to begin to write. By relying on the

power of the imagination, the writer discovers meaning through the act of composing.

Development of Inner Speech and Writing Intuitions

Inner speech is a form of communication with and for oneself. A thinker is his/her own conversational partner, knowing the intent of thought and understanding the inner web of meaning. As the writer's ability to distinquish the sense of words increases, so does flexibility of expression. The writer can express thoughts in individual style and can direct these thoughts with greater facility (Bruton, 1985).

Murray (1982) states "Rehearsal (planning) usually begins with an unwritten dialogue within the writer's mind" (p.62). Inner speech and intuition may be much the same thing before conscious awareness occurs.

According to Reed (1982), intuition is defined as the faculty of attaining direct knowledge or cognition without rational thought and inference. As Kantor (1984) suggests, intuitive writers are not necessarily conscious of such aspects as audience, revision strategies, and modes of discourse as they write.

In composition studies it is important to see how children develop concepts of what writing is all about, what value it holds for them, and how they strengthen their knowledge and intuitions to write more effectively. Many studies have been done that illustrate how young children develop their first notions of writing (Calkins, 1980; Graves, 1979; and Sowers, 1979). These studies have shown how children progress from an egocentric point of view to the use of aspects of the writer's craft, such as those proposed by Kantor. As the children develop, gains

can be made in motivation to write, fluency, voice, structure, and sense of audience. "The processes by which young people formulate their ideas of and attitudes toward writing represent a crucial kind of meaning-making, one essential to their growth as writers" (Kantor, 1984, p. 75).

Talking about personal experience is one way to encourage writing and is important to the development of writing ability. The value of experiential talk may be that it draws attention away from the writing itself, so that writing becomes a natural extension of experiences shared with others. This can reduce tension and apprehension that students might have about the writing itself. Growth in writing ability is a gradual process, often with maturity achieved only in adulthood (Kantor, 1984).

In composing, Murray (1978) feels that writers must trust their own intuitions and discover their own voices and areas of authority. In this way their writing will come alive. Writers can discover their individual power by being open to ideas, words, responses, and intuitions. As writers write, they explore the emerging meaning. The piece of writing takes shape as the writers write. Fluent writers may use free writing to get words onto the page and shape the meanings as they appear, thus using this idea generation for the meaning-making process. Listening to intuition is a key component in Murray's concept of writing and may be a key contribution to fluency in written expression (Bruton, 1985). Perl (1980) notes that the inner voice which she calls the "felt sense" from inside the writer's mind produces images, words, ideas, and feelings that writers use to guide planning,

drafting, and revising. It is also used to both discover and construct what is meant. Perl concluded that writers know more fully what they mean only after having written it. In this way the explicit written text serves as a window to the implicit sense with which one begins. Therefore, composing does not occur in a straightforward, linear fashion but in a reflexive, recursive way.

Apprehension

Some writers begin sentences without much thought and trust that meaning will emerge. If writers lack confidence in their abilities to put down thoughts and ideas into sentences that have meaning, their written fluency will be severely limited and their composing will suffer (Perl, 1979). The idea that people vary in how they feel about writing is not new. Some people enjoy writing more than others. Only recently, however, have investigations probed the nature of "writing apprehension," a term coined by Daly and Miller (1975). It may also be termed "writing anxiety." According to Daly and Wilson (1983), both terms refer to a person's tendency to avoid situations that may require writing accompanied by some amount of perceived evaluation. High apprehensive individuals find writing unrewarding, indeed, even punishing. Not only do they try to avoid writing, but when forced into it experience more than normal amounts of anxiety. This anxiety is often reflected in their written products and in their behaviors in, and attitudes about, writing situations. Low apprehensives represent the other end of the spectrum. They don't mind writing, are confident in their abilities to do so, and often enjoy it. Research has associated

apprehension with various choices people make, attitudes they hold, and differences in their writing skills and performances. Writing apprehension has been linked to both academic and occupational decisions (Miller and Daly, 1975). Highly apprehensive individuals prefer and choose occupations and majors they perceive will not require much writing. In contrast, low anxiety people like and select jobs and academic areas they judge to demand more writing. Within classrooms, apprehension affects satisfaction in coursework requiring writing, expectations of success in future writing courses, enrollment in advanced composition classes, and enjoyment of outside projects which demand writing (Miller and Daly, 1975). Classroom teachers evaluate highly apprehensive writers as significantly less likely to succeed in a variety of academic subjects. For the teachers themselves, their own writing apprehension affects their instructional behaviors in classrooms.

In terms of writing and writing related skills, research consistently reveals differences between high and low apprehensives. In quality, quantity, and vocabulary, high apprehensives score lower. This can in turn directly affect other factors such as self-esteem and personality (Daly and Wilson, 1983). However, writing apprehension deals only with the act of writing and, therefore, is limited in nature. The Daly and Wilson (1983) study shows that writing apprehension and self-esteem are linked only in a general way.

Conclusions

Studies of the writing process have proliferated since Emig's (1971) classic study of how students approached their writing tasks. Since that time the most important findings were reported by Applebee (1986) and are summarized here.

1. The writing process varies with the context in which it is embedded. Students vary their approaches to school writing to meet the demands of particular teachers, particular subject areas, and particular topics.

2. The revisions students make in their papers provide particularly concrete evidence of these variations in process. As the writing becomes more demanding (whether in terms of the audience, the function, or the importance of writing to the writer), the proportion of papers with revisions increases. The kinds of revisions that are made show less variation with rhetorical context, and more with the proficiency of the individual writer and the place in the process where they occur. Revisions of later drafts seem to be motivated by different concerns than are revisions of first drafts, though the specific differences again vary with the proficiency of the writer.

3. The topic-specific knowledge that a writer brings to a writing task has a particularly strong influence on the writing process. Tasks seem to differ in their demands on knowledge, however. On some writing tasks, students do best if they have a wide variety of loosely organized associations that they can draw upon in elaborating on the topic; on the other tasks, they do better if they start the task with a well-organized, even if smaller, body of topic-related knowledge.

4. Writing processes are learned, either through direct instruction in how to go about a task, or through accumulated experience of what works or doesn't work for a particular problem. Studies of the writing process are as much studies of past experience and instruction as they are of the ability or level of development of a particular writer.

5. Because writing processes are a function of context and task, the current research emphasis on the process may ultimately be as fruitless as the earlier emphasis on product. The most rewarding approaches to the study of writing may be those which include writing processes as strategies that are orchestrated in the course of a particular communicative event, with its own network of purposes and outcomes.

Applebee (1986) has argued that the process approach to writing instruction has failed. Two problems have prevented process-oriented instruction from having the influence that the journal literature suggests it should be having. The first problem stems from a lack of fit between the process activities and the goals of the teacher. Process-oriented activites are not appropriate to the typical uses of writing in the high school classroom. The extra time needed and lack of expertise that most teachers have in writing instruction are other factors contributing to the problem. Some teachers would feel threatened by this process because of the shift necessary from the traditional to the less secure position of opening up their instructional role for discussion and idea exchange.

The second problem as seen by Applebee (1986) is a result of the way in which process instruction has been inadequately conceptualized as a series of steps in the writing process. As these steps are incorporated at present into instructional programs, the activities become just as pointless and unimportant as the ones they were meant to replace.

Research on Written Composition

Effective reform requires a thorough understanding of the practices we wish to change or it will be no reform at all. Research can have great impact on writing instruction and the changes needed. Hillocks (1986b) reports that those who worked on the project which he conducted involving a meta-analysis of research on written composition were struck by the changes in research on writing over the last two decades. This work not only brought the research up to date, but pointed the way to new directions. This comprehensive work demonstrated how much new empirical studies have to offer.

Hillocks undertook this study when it became impossible to ignore the number of experimental studies that had been done in the last twenty years. Most were based on solid reason. Many focused on issues of concern to teachers and researchers. Many had rationales based on ideals or ideas about education, and others were based on classroom experience or previous research. Since new techniques had become available for integrating the results, it seemed wise to examine them for all these reasons.

Hillocks attempted to examine every experimental study of writing produced between 1963 and 1982. There were over 500 published studies. Those studies selected for inclusion had to involve a treatment: some combination of conditions, instructions, practice, and/or feedback leading to a post-test. Studies that examined the effects of certain conditions on a single piece of writing were not included. The studies accepted had to apply a scale of writing quality against the samples of writing. Studies that used only standardized test results were excluded, as were studies which only counted errors or various syntactic features in the writing samples.

The third criterion for acceptance was that the study had to exercise minimal control for teacher bias. To be included, a study had to control the differences among groups of students. Whether students were randomly assigned or carefully matched was carefully considered. Another consideration was that compositions used as writing samples in each study also had to have been scored under conditions which helped to assure validity and reliability.

Sixty studies were finally accepted which included 6,313 students in experimental groups, and 5,392 in control groups. These represented 73 experimental/control treatments. The average student in control groups, which were often described as using traditional teaching methods, made some progress in writing quality, but this progress was less than half that achieved by students in experimental classes. The concern in this analysis was what made a difference in increasing the quality of student writing.

Although Hillocks felt there was still much to learn from future research, the findings of this meta-analysis gave clear directions for practice and policy making, especially for grades 6 through 13, and especially in the mode and the focus of instruction. The findings indicate that what is commonly practiced in schools and colleges is the presentational mode of instruction and that is quite different from what has been recommended by the advocates of the natural process. Results showed the presentational mode as the least effective instructional mode examined. The natural process was 50 percent more effective, but still 25 percent less effective than the average experimental treatment. The individualized mode had the same results. The most effective mode of instruction, according to Applebee (1986), was the environmental mode because it brought teacher, student, and materials more nearly into balance and used all resources of the classroom, as the teacher orchestrates activities among students which are important to the process of writing. This mode seems to be a relatively recent development. Environmental instruction, a term coined by Hillocks, is defined by Applebee as "a series of process-oriented activities structured to avoid problems of implementation... and might better be labeled 'structured process'" (Applebee, 1986, p. 105). It moves beyond process, however, without abandoning it. Proponents of this mode of instruction recognize the need for prewriting, for example. In instruction they focus on prewriting activities which develop skills for writing in as many dimensions as possible. Environmental instruction may incorporate elements of both the presentational and the natural

process modes but, according to Hillocks, moves beyond both to suggest more powerful approaches to teaching composition.

The focus of instruction is another area that has important implications for instructional practice. For example, traditional grammar was found to have no effect on the quality of writing; in fact, at times there was even a negative effect. The use of models of good writing was significantly more useful. Free writing was better than the study of grammar but less effective than any other focus of instruction examined. The practice of combining sentences to make more complex sentences from a simple one is twice as effective as free writing. Scales, criteria, and specific questions which students can apply to their own writing affects the quality of writing. Students seem to be able to internalize them and use them to generate new ideas. These were two times more effective than free writing.

The use of inquiry involves students in finding details which will express personal experiences vividly, will support explanatory generalizations, and will help analyze problems and develop solutions. This type of writing is four times more effective than free writing and over two-and-a-half times more powerful than the traditional study of model pieces of writing.

Hillocks feels that all have a place in the curriculum if they are integrated with other techniques but that no recommendations will have effect if teachers are not trained to use the more effective teaching strategies. Surveys of instructional practices indicate clearly that the vast majority of teachers do not have the most effective teaching

strategies in their repertoires. They need effective in-service and pre-service training.

REVISION

According to Mohr (1984) the goals of revision in the writing process are the achievement of meaning and the achievement of form. Revision has been defined as instructional strategies that "must show student writers how to look at their work again, how to reread the text with an eye for change, if necessary" (Chew, 1985). Revision must involve a decision "to devote a period of time to systematic examination and improvement of the text" which has been produced (Flower and Hayes, 1980). Revision can mean rewriting a whole piece by reworking parts of the piece, redefining the focus of a draft, or reworking just a phrase or a few words. "Revision is the hardest and yet the most worthwhile step for writers" (Bencal, 1984). It should happen after every draft as a recursive loop through the writing processes because writing represents hands-on thinking. Rewriting is manipulative thinking; it is thinking about thinking (Calkins, 1980). According to Nancy Sommers (1978), revision has been conventionally perceived as a separate stage in the writing process--but only at the end of the process. This separate stage comes after the completion of a draft and is perceived as being completely separate from other writing activities. Therefore, it has been ignored, for the most part, by both teachers and researchers because it has been regarded as an isolated non-creative activity.

Revision as a study, however, has now come under scrutiny as part of the process of composing. Research has focused on what the student

does when revising. Errors in children's writing, Kantor (1979) notes, should be viewed as signs of growth, indications that the writer might be reaching for a higher level of understanding. Relatedly, Frank Smith (1982) contends that error is a necessary part of learning from the perspective of learning as hypothesis testing and the elaboration of prior knowledge. Revision shows maturity.

Empirical Research on What Students Do When They Revise

Research in Elementary Schools--Research has not always followed a chronological order of age or grade level in trying to determine what students do when they revise, but researchers have found that there are similarities across grade levels. In the primary grades, Lucy Calkins (1980) studied the revision strategies of third graders. She classified students into four groups which she considered developmental: (a) random drafting, (b) refining, (c) transition, and (d) interacting. These classifications were made according to the way the children made their revisions. Random drafters wrote successive drafts without examining their earlier drafts. Changes seemed to be arbitrary or accidental, and new material was added to the end without thought as to its appropriateness. Refiners made cosmetic and lexical changes which retained most of the first drafts. Transition students wrote draft after draft to try to develop satisfactory work. Instead of revising they started a new draft, but with new material they inserted the information in an appropriate place after rereading the original piece. Interacting revisers used what they had written to prompt new ideas

about changes needed. New material was added in the same way. These were the ones that examined what they wrote and thought of revision.

Birnbaum (1982) noticed that proficient writers in both fourth and seventh grade continually monitored their evolving texts and evaluated their choices in view of their purposes. They paused for selection of an appropriate word, idea, or structure, and for revision of these elements for stylistic reasons. Because of their wider experience in composing these students tended to be more aware of their success or failure in achieving their purpose and, therefore, they were willing to volunteer more evaluative comments, both negative and positive, about their own writing.

Less proficient writers seldom reread but did rescan for error. However, they made no revisions for ideational or stylistic reasons. They tended to avoid evaluation of their work.

Good writers learned to engage in a wide range of composing behaviors, from detached mechanical compliance to an involved commitment to transforming a personally meaningful experience into written language by means of revision. Birnbaum noted that differences in attitudes and activities of parents and teachers were associated with levels of proficiency in this study.

Graves (1979) finds that beginning writers do not typically revise. He notes that revision begins when children can choose their own topics. They find it easier to revise topics about personal experiences than about the experiences of others. Children who quickly arrive at a number of topics and learn to exclude some topics and write on others are learning to revise. If they can write a series of leads for those

topics, they demonstrate a strong capacity for revision. When children no longer erase, but instead cross out, draw lines and arrows for new information arrangements, or change their handwriting to a scrawl, they indicate a changed view toward words. Words become temporary or malleable and can be changed until the right meaning evolves for them, according to Graves. Children who write rapidly are more likely to revise in larger units and sustain a single composition for a larger period of time than those who write slowly. Graves also asserts that peer audiences have an effect on children's revisions and their use of new approaches to the writing process. Teachers can play a significant role by introducing new approaches, thereby releasing a child's potential for revision.

For the student to be able to write a lengthy and integrated piece, the mechanical parts of the writing process, such as spelling, punctuation, and capitalization rules, and handwriting, must become mostly automatic (Graves, 1982). Inadequate control over these parts slows the student and can prevent the student from concentrating on the larger writing task. Graves notes that in the primary grades as these mechanical parts are mastered children move toward concerns about the idea content of their writing and revision.

Building on the empirical studies of Graves and others, Nancie Atwell (1987) developed certain techniques after working with eighth graders which show teachers how to teach the writing stages and which seem to produce excellent student writers who have internalized the three-stage writing process as a natural part of their writing. Revision is heavily emphasized. Her techniques include:

1. Creating a writer's environment for the process to work
2. A status-of-the-class check every day as to progress
3. Daily group sharing for peer listening and editing
4. Conferencing with teachers and peers at any stage
5. Conferencing with oneself
6. Mini-lessons as needed for writing and revision
7. Using multiple drafts
8. Writing only on one side of paper
9. Scratching out to see the thinking process used instead of erasing
10. Saving everything--notes, doodles, writings--as idea stimulators.

Atwell describes a step-by-step program illustrating how it can be accomplished with eighth graders, which is a natural extension of the work of Graves (1982) who deals with primary grade levels. According to Atwell, by giving students control of their own writing, teachers can give them the freedom to plan, write, and revise many creative, imaginative, persuasive or descriptive pieces--whatever they choose--as well as poems or other types of writing. Atwell believes that her program would work anywhere (1987).

Research in Secondary Schools--On the secondary level Lillian Bridwell (1980) contends that high school seniors make fairly extensive revisions when given the opportunity. She developed a classification system of seven levels which shows the type of revisions made by writers. The easiest level is surface revision and is followed by

lexical, phrase, clause, sentence, multi-sentence and text revisions, each one showing a higher type of skill in revising.

Bridwell argues that all students engage in revision, though to varying degrees and for varying purposes. Most of the revisions occur at the surface or lexical levels, such as changes in spelling and punctuation or the addition, deletion or substitution of single words. Revisions frequently occur during the writing of a draft rather than at sentence levels or completion. The longer students have to work, the more they revise, and this suggests that they are writing and revising to discover meaning. However, those who engage in the most surface level revisions find problems in construction of meaning. They cannot seem to find the right words. Bridwell's study suggests that revision may be a function of both fluency and motivation. Bridwell concluded that many students have difficulty assessing their own work.

B. D. Monahan (1984) studied twelfth graders to see if there are differences between basic and competent writers in their revision strategies for different audiences. Results showed that a competent writer revised in noticeably different ways when preparing for two different audiences--the teacher and peers of the writer. For the teacher audience the writer revised by pausing and going back over the material written, but for peer audiences the writer revised more often and more extensively. Double the number of revisions were usual for the second paper than for the first.

For a basic writer, writing for a peer audience meant a considerably shorter draft than one for the teacher audience, with the

first draft containing fewer revisions than the second. Types of revisions were essentially the same for both audiences, however.

Carolyn Bolarsky (1981), looking at the writing of high school students describes eleven functions of revisions. They are:

1. Altering form
2. Organizing information
3. Creating transitions
4. Deleting information
5. Expanding information
6. Emphasizing information
7. Subordinating information
8. Creating immediacy
9. Improving syntactic structures
10. Improving language usage
11. Cleaning up (p. 3)

Bolarsky notes that most students concentrate on the last two categories only, which deal with "surface" level revisions--those that change single words, vocabulary, and grammar. Therefore, students do not engage in "deeper" level revision because of the writing instruction they receive.

Other conclusions drawn by Bolarsky are that effective writers concentrate on content while basic writers concentrate on penmanship. Effective writers consider audience more so than do basic writers and often revise in extended episodes which consist of groups of revisions that occur in a chain reaction. The first revision in such a chain reaction may be cued from within or without the text, but additional

changes seem to be cued by earlier revision in the text. In bringing about meaningful changes in text, the number of revisions that a writer makes is not as important as how the revisions relate. Monahan contends it might be worthwhile to investigate the nature of the cues that cause writers to revise in episodes and compare them with the cues that cause writers to make isolated revisions.

K. Butler-Nalin (1984) observed the revising patterns of high school students on their assignments. She found that fewer than half the papers collected are revised. The likelihood of students revising depend upon how demanding the writing task is. The more demanding the task in terms of audience, function, and importance, the more the papers are revised. Better writers make more higher level revisions and poorer writers make more surface level changes, but this tends to show a different pattern when extended into second or multiple drafts.

A study by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (Applebee, Langer, & Mullis, 1986) of writing trends across the decade between 1974 and 1984 used nine-year-olds, thirteen-year-olds, and seventeen-year-olds as subjects to show the need to spend more time on individual assignments with more planning or prewriting activities, more drafts and revisions before turning papers in, and more extensive comments in the teachers' responses. Results in 1974 showed that 54 percent of the seventeen-year-olds reported they usually rewrote their papers before turning them in; but by 1984 this had risen to only 59 percent. Trends at age 13 paralleled those at age 17.

Research at the College Level--At the college level Perl (1979) asserts that editing or revision play a major role in the composing

process of unskilled college writers. Soon after students begin to write their first drafts, they begin to edit and they continue to do so during the intervals between drafts, during the writing of their second drafts, and during the final reading of papers. Perl argues that students are concerned with lexicon (spelling, word choice, and the context of words), syntax (grammar, punctuation, and sentence structure), and the discourse as a whole (organization, coherence, and audience). But despite the unskilled students' attempts to proofread their work, serious errors remain in their finished drafts. Editing, Perl observes, intrudes so often and to such a degree that it breaks down the rhythms generated by thinking and writing. When this happens, students are forced to go back and recapture the strands of their thinking once the editing operation has been completed. Thus, editing sometimes occurs prematurely, before unskilled students have generated enough discourse to approximate the ideas they have, and it often results in their losing track of their ideas. Editing, too, is primarily an exercise in error-hunting. They seem to lack a conception of editing that includes flexibility, suspended judgment, the weighing of possibilities, and the reworking of ideas. From Perl (1979) comes the term "retrospective structuring." Thus, writers construct meaning as the writing moves along, re-reading to discover insight, and returning to writing again to construct and discover. Editing or revising has many levels, she concluded.

Hull (1987), looking at two groups of college writers, found while the more skilled writers almost always corrected more errors than the less skilled, the two groups performed similarly on standard essays. In

general the data showed the more skilled writers outperformed the less skilled in detecting more errors, and they improved at a higher rate.

On the other hand, Barbara Hansen (1978) concluded from her study that rewriting is a "waste of time." She worked with college freshmen to determine if greater skill in writing could be achieved by use of revision and rewriting. She found both groups make appreciable gains in composition skills. Activities that included revision and rewriting seemed to have no value. Correction sheets used had some value, but discussion of revision which was done with all groups may very well be the teaching procedure which improves the students' skills. Her recommendation was that teachers need to spend more class time on the why and how of revision and to realize that rewriting in and of itself will not strengthen a student's writing skills. Revision needs to be taught, not simply assigned.

According to Flower, Hayes, Carey, Schriver and Stratman (1986), revision is a perplexing subject. Everyone acknowledges its virtue, and yet research shows a large gap between teachers' claims and students' performance. Teachers claim that multiple drafts are the way to good writing, that revision can lead to re-seeing and restructuring, and that it is a powerful, generative process. Students, on the other hand, simply don't revise (Applebee, et al.,1986), or if they do, their compositions may be worse (Beach, 1979; Perl, 1979). Revising does not appear to be a generative process to them but instead a rule-governed activity for proofreading and correcting.

Richard Beach (1979) compared revision done because of teacher evaluation to that done by student self-evaluation. Using experienced

writers as a guide, Beach noted that good writers use their own and others' evaluation while they are writing drafts which in turn encourages further revision. By contrast, inexperienced writers in high school and college engage in little substantive reworking of content and organization of rough drafts; revising often consists of only "polishing up" minor editorial matters. Beach felt students do not engage in substantive revising of rough drafts because teachers usually only assess the final draft. If teachers would focus on the rough draft as well, students might be more willing to self-evaluate critically and revise the rough draft as well.

Since teachers with large classes often do not have the time to mark both drafts, one option might be to have a guided self-evaluation form for students to use. However, often students may simply not be capable of making revisions. They may change the rough draft, but that change does not necessarily mean improvement. In certain areas of writing, improvement may come more easily than in others.

In noting his results, Beach concluded that between-draft teacher evaluation promotes more revising than guided assessment of self-evaluation revision. The teacher's evaluation gives the students another perspective on whether or how the intended meaning has been communicated. Beach suggests more research is needed to examine the effects of assessment at various stages in the writing process.

Another conclusion drawn by Beach was that since students receive little or no instruction in methods of assessment they have difficulty in identifying their intentions, strengths, weaknesses or necessary changes. Further research should be conducted on developmental

differences in the ability to assess and the effects of instruction in self-assessing strategies on revising.

In total, Beach recommended between-draft teacher evaluation to gain a greater degree of change and higher fluency on final drafts. If composition teachers provide this kind of evaluation, they will encourage revising of drafts. Beach's study shows a promising direction for composition research--to study how writers' knowledge of the composing process influences their writing behaviors.

Other Research Conclusions--For students in general Schor (1983) finds revision to be an unappealing and a complex task. The exasperating truth is that more time is spent on recopying for neatness and completeness than any other single activity. The second most frequent change only corrects gross errors in mechanics, syntax, punctuation, and spelling. Larger moves in revising are not done. Schor notes that only by focusing on language can the writer track a new idea as it emerges in the act of revising and link it to existing ideas in the language of the first draft. Taking a close look at the language makes an inexperienced writer more aware of language concepts. Revision requires inventing new ideas and expressing their relationship to what already exists in the draft (Schor, 1983).

Hillocks (1982) contends that studies of revision have shown that students do make revisions from a first draft to a final draft and that the revisions they make improve the compositions in quality. When they have practice in revising focused on particular goals or skills over several pieces of writing, their writing skills can be affected in subsequent new pieces of writing, not simply in subsequent revisions.

In 1986 Hillocks wrote that younger children and even many college students confine their revisions to the cosmetic, lexical, and clause or phrase levels. Text-level changes, at least after some written text is produced, appear to be practically nonexistent, at least among the students involved in the studies examined in Hillocks's meta-analysis. Addition is a prominent strategy (Bridwell, 1980; Calkins, 1980; Sommers, 1980). But for the most part all indicate little about the cognitive processes involved in revising.

In her comparison of skilled adult writers to students Sommers (1980) proposes that most students do not use the terms revision or rewriting. In fact, they do not seem comfortable with those terms and have developed other terms, such as scratch out or do over again, to describe the type of changes they make. The students understand the revision process as a rewording activity and believe that most problems in their essays can be solved by rewording. All these are lexical rather than semantic changes. For the students, the extent to which they revise depends on their level of inspiration. They do not see a need to revise if they find they can write with ease on a topic. These students do not see revision as a activity to be used to modify and develop perspectives and ideas. They do not see revision as a recursive process. Writing to them is a linear process of composing. For skilled adult writers, however, revision is used to discover meaning in what they write and to find the form or shape of their argument. It is this sense of writing as discovery, Sommers found, that students fail to have. Without revision, students tend to blind themselves to what constitutes good writing.

Matsuhashi (1987) notes that revision is clearly a complex phenomenon, representing a range of creativity reflecting not only repair but a constant reevaluation of the evolving text. Without the option to revise, progress in producing text would stop. To inexperienced writers, however, revision is a trap, not an opportunity. They do not revise effectively because their attention is consumed by the low-level problems of generating ideas and writing the text.

In any event, regardless of function, revising is an operation of fundamental importance in formal writing that has no true parallel in informal discourse. It is this style of thinking--reflective, recursive thought and organization with imagination--that should be the focus of school instruction (Freedman and Calfee, 1984).

Empirical Research on Teacher Attitude

Teacher attitude toward writing in general does play an important role in influencing how writing is taught. Gere, Schuessler, and Abbott (1984) suggest that anxiety about writing on the teacher's part may influence attitudes toward writing instruction. Findings show these attitudes affect the way they define writing tasks and evaluate them for students, as well as influencing their own linguistic maturity. People who do not themselves enjoy and practice writing, Smith (1981) asserts, cannot effectively teach children how to write. Teachers must demonstrate what writing does and how to do it. A teacher who perceives writing as a tedious chore with trivial applications will teach those things. The best way to teach writing is to share the writing experience with students and to learn that writing is a natural,

enjoyable, and highly productive way to spend one's time. Revision is just part of that process.

J. A. Carroll (1986) also argues that teachers can become more aware of the writing process and how it affects the written products of students by writing themselves and learning about theories of writing which enhance classroom practices. Since writing is a mode of learning, teachers can also accomplish efficient curricular change. Bolarsky (1981) believes that unless teachers fully understand the writing process they are constrained from helping students revise their writing as effectively as they might.

Graves (1979) described the teachers he observed as having high personal standards of craftsmanship when they taught writing, especially when they wrote themselves. The children became aware of the teachers' crafts. Where writing flourished, it was but one form of expression. Once personal expression was valued, it was not contained with writing alone. These teachers provided time for writing for the children and themselves. There was encouragement for every step of the writing process. The teachers' first response, however, was to content. Language was dealt with in later drafts, and revising was a natural part of the process. Writing occurred in a community which seemed to have more to do with standards of excellence than any other factor. Graves could not explain this phenomenon and realized more research would have to done in this area. In continuing his research, Graves (1982) further notes that writing is problem solving and teachers need to know the nature of the problems solved by the children, how important they are for growth, and what to do about them in the classroom. When a child

has a problem, that is a moment for teaching, centered in helping children solve problems for themselves. Otherwise, the teacher will be the one in control of the writing process and not the children. Children grow as writers as they wrestle with imbalance and revision between their intention and the problem at hand. Teachers can help children help themselves. Control in the writing classroom should be in the hands of the children.

Graves also states that teachers should ask questions to find out how children change. The thinking, growth, and development of the child can be determined by the teacher in this way. In writing, teachers should look for the child's use of detail, ability to talk about the subject, sense of options, judgment, and growing language to talk about the process of writing and revising. Children grow because they become aware of what they are doing and then forge ahead to new issues in composing. The questions of teachers who are aware of this development can make an important contribution to that growth.

Shirley Haley-James (1981), in writing about revision being taught in the upper grades, notes that to help these students learn <u>to</u> revise, as well as <u>how</u> to revise, teachers can start before the writing begins. Students have to care about their writing if they are to revise. Purpose and meaning must both emerge before teachers can expect students to revise. Teachers must ask questions about the meaning while students are drafting.

Glatthorn (1982) tries to demystify the teaching of writing and briefly stated what the experts recommend, what research suggests, and what experienced teachers have discovered. He encourages time for "free

writing" in journals which could be used for more structured work. By offering a more comprehensive writing program, teachers could have students write poems, stories, and plays and write about books they've read. Essays and essay questions can be inserted. Choice of topic and exploring and planning by various methods such as brainstorming will help them to learn new thinking and writing skills. Letting them share their work and acting as audiences for others will help the students edit and revise their own work. Praise instead of corrections will help them enjoy writing. Work done carelessly should never be acceptable.

Some knowledge of the composing process, some suggestions about how to teach writing, and some cautions about what not to do--all represent a foundation for a writing program that would work, according to Glatthorn. But he claims the rest is up to the teacher--to discover the special needs of the students, to find the best way to teach, and to be enthusiastic about the craft of writing and revision.

Hillocks (1982) contends that nearly all studies of teacher comment and revision ignore or preclude prewriting instruction designed to prepare students for particular writing assignments. Calkins (1986) argues that because children often do not know what revision is, teachers need to help them to see what revision entails, since they will revise anyway by perhaps correcting spelling and punctuation or by changing some of the words and adding others. With the use of mini-lessons, teachers can teach many strategies for revision such as expanding, changing mode, reworking one particular section of a place, shortening a piece, or reconsidering voice or tone. Teachers can

encourage new strategies for one or two or an entire class in prewriting activities.

Marie Clay (1982) asserts that children can free themselves from being context-bound and learn to write for audiences of many different kinds. This increasing flexibility which allows a child to select from a variety of language options is a necessary feature of learning to write. This insight into the development of writing in children brings up several important issues in viewing what teachers do about writing instruction and how they teach the process approach of prewriting, writing, and revision.

Empirical Research on Writing Instruction

Beach (1986) comments on the fact that teachers cannot simply tell students how to assess their own writing. He suggests conferencing between teacher and student so that needed techniques could be demonstrated by the teacher. According to Beach, the stages of assessing are describing, judging, and selecting appropriate revisions.

With each student, Beach tries to determine the particular difficulty by analyzing his or her use of these stages. To help students, Beach uses questions which guide them in assessing their own work. These questions follow the assessing stages he uses:

Describing

1. What are you trying to say or show in this section?
2. What are you trying to do in this section?
3. What are some specific characteristics of your audience?
4. What are you trying to get your audience to do or think?

Judging

5. What are some problems you perceive in achieving 1, 2, and 4 above?

Selecting appropriate revisions

6. What are some changes you can make with these problems? (pp. 58-59.)

Students divide their drafts into sections to use the form and in so doing give the teacher a good idea of their difficulty in assessing their own work. Then the teacher can demonstrate the technique needed, can let the students revise, or can demonstrate further if there is still difficulty. In one conference there should be only one or two techniques demonstrated. Over time Beach has noticed marked changes.

Toby Fulwiler (1982) writes that most teachers know experientially and intuitively that revision is necessary for good writing; yet, at the same time they seldom give writing assignments that use that tacit knowledge. This applies across all disciplines in the curriculum. Fulwiler suggests intensive writing workshops for all faculty members. At the very least this would illustrate that writing serves two distinct functions, aiding learning and facilitating communication. Revision is critical to both functions, involving rewriting and rethinking. Once teachers understand the truly critical importance revision plays in the learning process, they will value revision and will feel comfortable teaching it.

CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN

"...the design of a naturalistic inquiry...cannot be given in advance; it must emerge, develop, unfold."
Lincoln and Guba (1985)

This study used a qualitative research design. Qualitative research is an umbrella term used to refer to several research strategies that share certain characteristics. The data collected is considered "soft"--rich in description of people, places and conversations, and not easily handled by statistical procedures. In-depth interviews and observations are representative means of collecting data. This material is supplemented by other data such as tapes of all conversations, observations and interviews, work written by students, and work sheets and other materials handed out by the teachers.

The research questions used in this study lent themselves to the utilization of qualitative research design and naturalistic inquiry. Qualitative research is frequently called naturalistic because the observer sees events as they naturally occur. According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), naturalistic inquiry can be defined as a kind of inquiry in which the investigator is open to all elements of the situation and is willing to receive any information from it. Under the conditions of naturalistic observations, the behavior studied is subject to the influences of the natural setting rather than the specialized influences of research settings. Therefore, qualitative research design is an evolving process. Through observation, human behavior can be studied

within the framework where the subjects interpret their thoughts, feelings, and actions.

According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), the case study is the best reporting mode for naturalistic inquiries. It is the most useful in raising understanding and maintaining continuity in the reporting process. It allows the researcher to chronicle and render at a descriptive level and to engage in interpretation and evaluation. Case study analysis is appropriate for an intensive, in-depth examination. It is a traditional methodology for basic research when there are large voids of knowledge. The case study as a mode of inquiry involving one writer or a small sample of writers has been shown to be a legitimate and useful methodology for the alert and sensitive observations that the composing process demands (Emig, 1971; Graves, 1975; Mischel, 1974; Perl, 1979; Sommers, 1978). The major data-gathering technique is participant observation.

Other advantages of the case study method are:

1. The case study is the primary vehicle for emic inquiry.
2. The case study builds on tacit knowledge.
3. The case study is an effective vehicle for demonstrating the interplay between inquirer and respondents.
4. The case study provides an opportunity to probe for internal consistency.
5. The case study provides the "thick description" so necessary for judgments of transferability.
6. The case study provides a grounded assessment of context (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p.359).

The case study by itself, however, is not enough and should be accompanied by the methodology of the naturalistic inquiry. In the natural setting of the school room, therefore, observations were made and data collected for a qualitative research project, with the major objectives of the three case studies (a) to describe and analyze the teaching of the revision processes by three writing teachers, and (b) to make comparisons of the revision processes as taught by these three teachers.

This was a comparative case study, using multiple sites. There were two junior high schools and one middle school involved, all in the suburban areas of a large midwestern city. As the study progressed, these questions were considered:

1. How do teachers view the revision process? What purposes and value does it have for them and their students?
2. How do teachers help their students to make revisions and to learn to revise effectively? What kinds of classroom lessons, activities, or processes do teachers use to teach revision and how much time is allocated to it?
3. What is the relationship between what the teacher believes about revision and how he/she is teaching revision?
4. How do students perceive revision and what do they do when they revise? How do they perceive their teacher's approach to revision or the instruction they receive?
5. What are the implications of the findings of this study for teaching and teacher education in the area of writing?

POPULATION AND SAMPLING

These case studies involved three teachers of writing in eighth grade. The teachers selected were from those recommended by professors of writing who had conducted workshops in many different school districts and by curriculum directors who had worked with teachers who were interested in writing instruction. Criteria used for selection of subjects included the following points: (a) They placed strong emphasis on writing instruction in their classrooms, (b) they used a process-oriented method of teaching writing, (c) they taught revision as an essential part of the process, and (d) they had a reputation for excellence in teaching language arts. Participation of the teachers was voluntary. Permission to enter these classrooms for observation was needed and, therefore, administrative approval was obtained.

The teachers were all from suburban school districts near a large midwestern city. The socioeconomic strata for students in these districts was white upper middle class. The first teacher recommended and selected was Carol Miller of Oakdale Junior High. Carol had taught for ten years, eight at Oakdale. She taught writing as part of a eighth grade language arts class from 10:56 to 11:38 a.m. daily. Her writing sessions were varied. Usually she worked on writing Thursday and Friday each week but sometimes spent a whole school week on one project. She varied her procedures. Using the process approach, at times she had the class brainstorm for writing ideas, for example. The next step in formulating ideas--preplanning--was sometimes done in outline form with discussion as well. Writing, editing, and revising usually took two to

three weeks for one project. She used the class as an audience for student writing. Carol was very enthusiastic about what she did and was eager to share.

The second teacher chosen was Linda Warner at Broadview Middle School. She had taught for ten years, with eight at Broadview. At the time she was teaching eighth grade. Her interest in the techniques of Nancie Atwell (1987) stemmed from her reading Donald Graves's book, Writing: Teachers and Children at Work (1983), but she found his ideas, which cover primary grades, really did not work well in junior high. Atwell, on the other hand, had adapted many of the ideas of Graves for use with eighth graders. Linda was experimenting with change using the Atwell techniques in the writing portion of a language arts class that met daily from 10:05 to 10:50 a.m. She was not sure how it would all turn out, but she was quite enthusiastic about the work she was doing.

Sarah Osborne from Meadowhill Junior High School was the third teacher chosen. She had thirteen years teaching experience and was interested in classroom change. Her eighth grade communications class was a writing workshop also using the techniques of Nancie Atwell based on her book, In the Middle (1987). In this class which met every day from 11:00 to 11:45 a.m., Sarah was also doing research for her Master's degree on the writing process. In this instance a writing workshop can be defined as a classroom where students were free to work at their own pace. They were instructed on a need-to-know basis with individual help given by the teacher. A workshop tends to be unstructured in organization, but both structure and control can be maintained by the interest and enthusiasm of the teacher. With this class Sarah planned

to go through mini-lessons to establish the process approach to writing in the workshop, and afterwards she planned to start the process of prewriting, writing, and revision, using as her guide the Atwell book. She seemed very enthusiastic about this project and eager to experiment with change. This was the first time she had tried the process approach based on the Atwell techniques.

The selection of these teachers expanded the scope of the study, made it possible to refine the questions under investigation, and generated new lines of inquiry. These three teachers were not only interested in research, but also in finding new ways to improve the way they taught.

This type of sampling is called simple criterion-based selection, according to Goetz and LeCompte (1984). It requires that the researcher create a recipe of the attributes essential to the selected unit and proceed to find or locate a unit that matches the recipe. Unique-case selection would also apply here since these teachers were chosen for their ability to teach language arts and the writing process. Reputational-case selection is a variation of unique-case which would be appropriate as well and is based on the reputations of the teachers chosen.

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

My morning hours were available for this research. The ideal time span for observation was from October to May, but due to classroom procedures this was not possible or even necessary. A great deal depended on what was going on in each class. On the average, four days

a week were used for observation. However, there were weeks when classroom activity necessitated observation every day, for it was possible that a writing unit was to be taken every day for a number of weeks or a particular project was in process for a set amount of time. Some teachers wanted students to write several days each week all during the school year in order to establish good writing habits. Therefore, I finally scheduled my observations from October to the end of March, which included all Tuesdays and Wednesdays with Sarah in her writing workshop, while Thursdays and Fridays were divided between Carol and Linda in two- or three-week writing sessions for their language arts classes. In each instance I was allowed to tape record daily observations, conversations, and interviews (see Appendix E-2). The schools where the observations took place were within driving distance. After teachers were selected, I obtained permission to enter the school from the principal or other school administrators as needed.

Pre-observation structured interviews involved the teachers and the principals (see Appendix A-1). The questions I asked were devised to gather data on their background and how these individuals viewed writing and revision. It was a beginning of the comparison of what they said in relation to what they did. Other data sources included written documents and artifacts such as the weekly lesson plans of the teachers, the writing curriculum, papers from the students, a journal written by each teacher, my field notes (written both during and after observation), the textbooks used by teachers and students, tapes used to record classroom behaviors and the transcripts that resulted, and context maps of room arrangements (see Figure 1). During the time of

Figure 1
Data Sources

	Documents	Observations	Interviews
Curriculum	School policies Curriculum guides Writing curriculum	Classroom Students Teachers Observer's field journal	Curriculum Director Principal
Teacher-Instructional Design	Teacher journal Weekly lesson plans Handouts, Worksheets	Observer's field journal Tapes and transcripts Writing process	Pre and Post interviews with teachers
Teacher - Student interaction	Textbooks used Papers from students	Observer's field journal Tapes and transcripts	Student

observation, I also conducted informal interviews with teachers and students. These were taped, along with other events that transpired during the school period. Since patterns of behavior observed set the direction interviews took, outlines for structured questions were written as the patterns emerged. Naturalistic procedures of observation and recording allowed the patterns of behavior to emerge as they would, and then to be described and compared. This was the constant comparative method as outlined by Bogdan and Biklen (1982), in which the data collected can be used to answer the questions behind the study and generate new questions as well. A data reduction chart (see Appendix E-3) helped to clarify the meaning of the observations, the interviews, and the tapes, while the teacher lesson plans, handouts, worksheets, and student papers provided evidence of the continuity and effect of the instruction. My logs and Sarah's journal were further aids in comparing the patterns of behavior.

After the observations were concluded, I conducted post-observation interviews with the teachers (see Appendix A-2), and the questions were tailored to fit the circumstances for each teacher of each class. The questions came from what had been observed, what had been said, what had been handed out, lesson plans, personal notes in my logs and in the logs of the teachers, what students had written or said, or from any source that pertained to the study at hand. Although there were some questions asked of all three teachers, many were individualized from behavior patterns observed or taped. Then the data was triangulated and feedback to the teacher was given if desired.

The coding methods I devised were major categories suggested by Bogdan and Biklen (1982, pp. 156-62) and adapted to this study. They included:

1. Setting and context codes--refer to general information on the setting, topic, or subjects, such as descriptions of the community, school, policies, programs available, school buildings, or the student body.
2. Situation codes--refer to how subjects define the setting or topic and how they see themselves and their world, such as teachers describing their feelings about their work, the writing process, or the revision part of the process.
3. Perspectives held by subjects--refer to the ways of thinking which are not general but which are shared by some or all of the subjects, such as personal viewpoints teachers have on children or the revision process.
4. Process codes--refer to schemes used in ordering life histories and are especially useful in case studies, such as (1) early life, (2) elementary school days, or (3) college work, particularly related to writing courses or methods courses.
5. Activity codes--refer to regularly occurring kinds of behavior, such as lunch, conferences, writing or revising.
6. Strategy codes--refer to the tactics, methods, techniques, maneuvers, ploys, and other conscious ways people accomplish various things, such as the methods teachers use to teach writing or revision, or to control behavior in the classroom.
7. Relationship and social structure codes--refer to regular

patterns of behavior among people, such as reflected in the structure of a writing classroom.

8. Methods codes--refer to research procedures, problems, joys or dilemmas, such as my personal observations as a researcher.

When a great deal of information was collected, coding categories were most helpful to make the project manageable. A coding system also was necessary to facilitate the sorting of data and was developed from techniques suggested by Bogdan and Biklen (1982, pp. 162-70) and is as follows:

CODING FOR FIELDNOTES

Description of School

1. Location
2. Physical
3. Historical
4. Student population
5. Neighborhood or community
6. Teachers
7. Policies

The Class

8. Location in school
9. Physical description of classroom
   a. Use of space
   b. Seating arrangements
10. Grade
11. Members of the class

12. Student interaction with students

13. Student non-academic activities

The Teacher and/or Other Personnel

14. Style

15. History

    a. Early life

    b. Teaching

16. Perspectives

17. Relationships to children

18. Additional personnel in classroom

19. Teacher feelings and comments on work, curriculum, teaching

20. Working with student distractions or inappropriate behavior

21. Interaction with students

22. Teacher comments on students to observe

Principal and Other Administrative Personnel

23. Their part in and relationship to writing program

24. Other things to be done for program

    a. Materials

    b. In-service opportunities

    c. Other

Prewriting

25. Brainstorming

26. Lesson review

27. Teacher explanations/directions

28. Introduction of new material

29. Student reactions

The Writing Process

30. Student writing

31. Teacher monitoring

32. Lessons to do

33. Students writing on own

34. Rough drafts

35. Other writings

With the methodology planned and the observations completed, the data was reduced, summarized, interpreted, and evaluated to obtain the results. These will be discussed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 4. RESULTS

With a diversity of collected data that is usual with a naturalistic study, categories of information must be established to make the task of reporting the results possible. Those that I set up for this study included (a) a background introduction, (b) each teacher's general response to children, (c) their philosophy of writing and the use of any writing theories, (d) their general preparation for writing in the class, (e) how they created a writing atmosphere, (f) their thoughts on revision and how they taught it, and (g) a comparison of what they said about revision to what they actually taught in the classroom. These were also the categories chosen for the data reduction chart (see Appendix E-3). Organizing the data under these headings made the task of reporting the results much easier and made it possible to answer the questions asked at the beginning of this study. To answer the first question, for example--how teachers view the revision process--category (f), their thoughts on revision and how they taught it, was used to organize the discussion on that point. To satisfy the questions pertaining to students and their perceptions, a separate column for student response for each of the seven categories above was written on the data reduction chart for each teacher. In this way it was possible to see how students perceived revision, what they did when they revised, and their reaction to the instruction they received. The purpose of the introduction is to provide information needed on the schools and the communities involved and to give background material on

each of the three teachers chosen. The remainder of the chapter will present the findings on each teacher with a summary section comparing ways in which each taught revision.

INTRODUCTION

The three school districts involved in this study are all located in suburban communities near a large midwestern city. The communities are affluent suburbs, described as upper middle class or higher on the socioeconomic scale. The parents are actively involved in school affairs and concerned about their children's education, for they have high expectations for their children and want good teachers and programs. School boards and administrative personnel are influenced by parent demands. The schools stress excellence and achievement in education and pride themselves in the accomplishment of their goals. The communities are very much alike in many ways, but even with similar demographics in size, socioeconomic factors, community attitudes, and parental interest in the schools, these three districts still have teachers who taught very differently.

The first school to be included in the study was Oakdale School, a junior high in a district with three feeder schools. Oakdale School consisted of seventh and eighth grade only, although there was talk of adding the sixth grade classes to the building as the student enrollment dwindled. At the time of observation the student body numbered about 350. The seventh and eighth grades were departmentalized. The language arts program for each of these grade levels consisted of two 40-minute periods every day, with literature and reading in one period and

spelling, grammar, and writing in the other. It was possible to have a different teacher for each period. One constant frustration for teachers was in dealing with this scheduling problem that affected curriculum. Those who taught writing felt there was nothing to connect the writing to, since it was difficult to teach it in isolation. Because the literature program was taught by someone else, they had to be careful what and how they taught so as not to infringe on another teacher's province.

Carol started teaching ten years ago. She took time out from teaching when she had children but returned to it after obtaining a Master's degree in the Teaching of English some years later. She was always mystified by the writing process and how it was evaluated by teachers when she was in school. There seemed to be no criteria to go by. It intrigued her to think there was some kind of magic formula that enabled teachers to give each written piece a grade.

Now she enjoys the teaching of writing herself. Because of the way language arts was scheduled, however, she felt she could not connect the writing to the literature program. Instead she used other stories she found herself to illustrate points she wished to make. Her goal was to teach expository writing, first with one paragraph and then with multi-paragraph essay writing to prepare her eighth graders for high school. She wanted to show her students exactly what she was looking for before a grade was put on the paper. She considered herself a traditional teacher. Carol's basic writing approach was the process approach but with a traditional twist. This meant that the planning, writing, and revising exercises were all devised and guided by her. She

assigned the topics for the written work. There was no freedom of topic choice for students.

Carol enjoyed writing her own poetry but kept it secret. She shared it very rarely with her students and only sometimes with her family. She wrote when she felt strongly about various issues or when she was frustrated or upset. To her, poetry was not only a very personal thing, but was also a method of really opening up and coming to grips with how she felt about some things which were fun and enjoyable, but private.

Carol did not keep a journal herself. She had tried using them with students but found it difficult because she shared a classroom with another teacher. She found that students were quite reluctant to write anything that might be read by other students who were in someone else's class. She felt they lacked trust in the situation, for they did not want strangers to read what they had written.

The second school to be included in the study was Broadview Middle School, which was in a district with only two schools. One was a primary building, kindergarten through third grade; the other was Broadview Middle School, which contained grades four through eight. Broadview was departmentalized for the seventh and eighth grades only. For language arts the scheduling permitted two periods every day, one for literature and reading, and the other for spelling, grammar, and writing. It was possible to have a different teacher for each period. Elective courses were taught on the quarterly system as well. One scheduling factor that caused frustrations occurred every quarter when electives changed, for this meant changes in student schedules.

Students in an academic class could be moved in or out of a classroom to suit quarterly elective changes. Continuity sometimes suffered when new students appeared and were not able to catch up in the new class.

Linda had been a language arts teacher for ten years, mostly in this district. She lived in the community in which she taught. The previous year while working in a Master's program, she became interested in process approach writing programs when she had to choose a topic for a project. For this project she decided to use techniques from Graves's book, Writing: Teachers and Children at Work (1983), in promoting writing with her eighth grade classes, and she was very successful with it. She found it interesting and stimulating. This school year she wanted to add techniques from Atwell's In the Middle (1987) to her program because she felt the Graves techniques tended more toward the primary grade levels. She was looking for something that was better suited to eighth graders. She was willing to experiment, but she did not know how it would turn out. Linda's basic writing approach was a process approach emphasizing the three stages of planning, writing, and revision. She had few rules but wanted her students to choose their own topics. According to Graves (1979), when children begin to choose their own topics they have begun to revise. Linda also wanted them to discover the process for themselves through writing. She did not believe in handing out worksheets or other handouts because she believed this would influence their writing.

Linda was herself a successful writer of children's stories. In an interview she modestly claimed that since she had had an interest in writing she took a class which helped steer her in the right direction.

She had published five stories and continued to write all the time, but only at home. As for a journal, she was not interested in keeping one, although she did during the time she was working on her Master's project.

The third school to be included in this study was in the Meadowhill district where there were two elementary schools feeding into a junior high school with a student population of 398. The Meadowhill Junior High, where observation was conducted, housed sixth, seventh, and eighth grade. The school was departmentalized with students moving to different classrooms. Language arts for the seventh and eighth graders was divided into two periods lasting 40 minutes each, with one period devoted to reading and literature and the second period, called Communications, used for spelling, grammar, and writing. Both classes met daily for the entire year. It was possible that a teacher could have a student for both periods of language arts, but not necessarily. This split in the curriculum was done for scheduling purposes.

Sarah had been a language arts teacher for thirteen years, mostly in this district. In a pre-observation interview she noted that she enjoyed change in the classroom and was willing to experiment with new ideas. Being versatile, she chaired the language arts department and at times helped to put on school plays. For some time she had been interested in teaching writing and had wanted to make it a point of emphasis, but curricular demands made this impossible. In looking back, she felt that she had only assigned writing before and had never really taught it. She also thought she had taught revision, but she later

realized she never really had. What she taught was proofreading since she did not feel that she had a true understanding of what revision was.

When she enrolled in a Master's program, she was compelled to come up with a project for her degree. Since she was so interested in writing, she chose her topic in this area because it had always bothered her to think she was sending her eighth grade students on to the next grade without good writing skills. She read Graves's Balance the Basics: Let Them Write (1978) and found his approach too elementary, but when her advisor recommended Atwell's In the Middle (1987), she realized that here were answers to questions she had asked herself. Atwell's thinking and feelings were identical to what she had thought and felt. Atwell's methods, therefore, seemed a logical choice since her techniques seemed to target in on what Sarah was looking for. She became a teacher-researcher in her Communications classes.

Sarah commented that if it hadn't been for her Master's project she might not have been able to change her writing program in the same way since she had no idea she was approaching writing in the "wrong way." She only knew she was not actually teaching enough writing. More writing might have been assigned, but she realized later she had not actually taught writing or revision. Her basic approach to writing became a three-stage process which included a planning stage for thinking of a topic and planning what kind of writing would best suit; a writing stage to get ideas down on paper; and a revision stage when changes could be made to clarify, to polish, or to delete until the finished project reflected the exact thinking of the writer. The students had choice of topic and the mode and style of their written

pieces, which according to Graves (1979) represents the first step of revision.

Sarah chose to use a writing workshop format as the best way to conduct her program. A writing workshop can be many things. In this instance a writing workshop could be defined as an open classroom where students were free to work at their own pace. They were instructed on a need-to-know basis with individual help given by the teacher. A workshop tends to be unstructured in organization, but structure and control here were maintained by the teacher's interest in individual students as conferences took place, in monitoring as she walked around the room, or in how the class time was used, all of which showed the teacher was aware of how time was spent by the student. The control of this classroom remained in the hands of the teacher even though she gave her students freedom to explore, to plan, to write, and to share work for revising and feedback.

Personally, Sarah reported that not only did she enjoy writing herself, but thought of herself as a writer as well. One motivation for becoming a teacher was writing, for a dream of hers had always been to be a professional writer of children's books. She had kept a journal for a number of years which she used at times to write about her family and other times to deal with feelings and issues that concerned her. The journal represented something she was doing for her daughter so that someday she'd know how Sarah felt about some things. It was also one way Sarah had to work at her writing, for when she had more leisure time she wished to do more of it. Her journal made her feel she was keeping in touch with her feelings. Because she enjoyed writing in a journal,

she asked her students to keep one as well. Topics were assigned but the journals could include anything else that the student wanted to write about. There was no grade given for journal writing. The journal could be an outlet for students' ideas, thoughts, and feelings or whatever they wished it to be.

These three school districts were very much alike in size, community attitudes, socioeconomic factors, and parental interest in the schools. The administrators and the school boards reflected the community attitudes about excellence and achievement. The principals were supportive of good academic practices and backed these teachers in their efforts. The three teachers involved in three different school districts dealt with three sets of students who were all quite similar in their attitudes and expectations as well as their background. The teachers also had much in common, in their age, the years they had taught, and their feelings about writing. All these similarities highlighted the differences in the teachers and the way they taught writing. It became increasingly clear it was how the teacher viewed writing personally, how she taught writing, and especially how she taught revision that was important to this study.

PROFILE OF AN EIGHTH GRADE LANGUAGE ARTS TEACHER OF WRITING--CAROL

Room 210 of Oakdale Junior High was on the second floor. The main part of the room contained five rows of desk chairs with five chairs in each row. At the front of the room was the teacher's desk with a long blackboard covering most of the wall behind it. Over the blackboard hung maps rolled up for later use in a social studies class which met

there also. One side wall was made of a corklike material that made it into a large bulletin board from floor to ceiling. The other side wall had a bulletin board near the front of the room and windows that extended the back of the room into a small alcove behind the back wall of the room. It led out to the corridor but was not the only door out of the room. There wasn't anything in the alcove, and the only time it was used was during the small editing group gatherings of the writing class. At that time it was used by one or more groups for more privacy. Against the rest of the back wall of the room were book cases, work tables, cabinets, and a magazine rack, all used by another teacher for social studies classes. Near the back was a conference table that was moved to various locations from time to time by the other teacher as well. It was not used by Carol's classes at all. The class consisted of twenty students, thirteen girls and seven boys.

Writing was done on Thursdays and Fridays, with the writing projects following the same pattern for the entire year. One writing project usually took two days every week over a three-week period, although some did take longer. At times, the teacher noted, a whole week could be set aside for writing, but this schedule was never observed. All writing was assigned.

Each project consisted of a short story selection with worksheets and handouts designed by the teacher to help the students plan, write, and revise one or more essay paragraphs. It was a literature-focused program.

The class period was forty minutes. The division of time was different for all activities. Brainstorming on worksheets for planning

purposes usually took the entire period, especially if the end result was to be more than one written paragraph. At this time discussion of the story also took place for greater understanding but not for literary style. The teacher always chose a short story that was different from the students' regular literature work. The students each received a duplicated copy of the selection with handouts and/or worksheets that the teacher had devised (see Appendix B). After reading the story for homework, the students were led by the teacher in a brainstorming session which helped them to answer the worksheets attached. From these worksheets each student was to write a paragraph or more, depending on the assignment, using the material at hand. After the paragraph was written, the students huddled in previously established editing groups of two to four. They used editing sheets designed and handed out by the teacher with each selection to aid them in helping one another, since extra points were given for good editing skills (see Appendix B-3). The teacher went from group to group during the editing sessions to advise, ask questions, make suggestions, and give answers at times. Teacher conferencing could be very short or lengthy, depending on what was discussed. A typical exchange might be the following:

Student: I have a problem. Is this clear?

Teacher: Have you said what it means earlier in your paragraph?

Student: No, that's my problem. See, right here. I have it...but then it goes right here, but that's not quite right. O.K. I don't know where I should put this.

Teacher: You need to say what it means in your own words. What does it mean?

Student: Well, it means that he doesn't care for all the learning that he gets.

Teacher: Right. The things in the material world. O.K.? That's what you need to explain. If you use this at the end you would have to interpret it earlier and then you can say he sees this..., but you have to make it very clear what this quote means then. You can't just tag it on.

Student: I didn't know if I was supposed to repeat myself again or I wasn't supposed to do that.

Teacher: So you haven't moved here. You can write that the physical world had become more important to him than money ever could. Later on you can address the fact that this changes...and explain it. Then you can use this quote at the end. But you can't use it if you haven't gone into it. O.K.?

Editing groups were usually given one period, but sometimes more time was needed. The paragraphs, when corrected by editing much like proofreading, were then handed in. The teacher duplicated perhaps a dozen papers, without names, for a class discussion and a brainstorming session to have them see what might still be done. The focus of comments ranged from surface mistakes such as spelling to deeper meanings. But as Birnbaum (1982) noted, as these students became more proficient, detached mechanical compliance evolved into a commitment to produce a personally meaningful experience by means of revision. Instead of remaining at the surface and lexical levels of revision, as noted by Bridwell (1980), these students moved toward higher levels of

revision. The seven levels mentioned by Bridwell were surface, lexical, phrase, clause, sentence, multi-sentence, and text revisions, with each level including more difficult tasks as the student moved up the scale. Carol usually devoted one class period to discussion of the written paragraphs. It was all done in a relaxed manner, with the teacher as the guiding force of this writing program.

When the projects began in the fall, Carol carefully guided the brainstorming and discussion, but as time passed and the students became more aware of what editing was and how it was done, the comments and discussions became more student oriented. Without much prompting, students were able to pick up editing ideas and correct the paragraphs. After all the discussion was over, students were given one last chance to edit before the papers were read by the teacher for a final grade. This was where the Bridwell (1980) levels were looked at closely and final changes were made, but not all students chose to use this last opportunity. When the papers were marked, evaluation sheets were attached so the student could see how the papers were graded (see Appendix B-4).

The first thing observed about Carol was that she had a great deal of enthusiasm. She was also a very open and sincere but relaxed and gentle person.

Carol commented in an interview that she considered herself a traditional teacher, in the sense that she assigned the readings and the written pieces, led the class discussions, and guided the students to the conclusions she wanted. It was a very structured conventional classroom, but there also seemed to be an informal, relaxed give and

take between student and teacher that helped to make the classroom work. She had read some of the works of Arthur Applebee, but mostly she remembered expert speakers such as George Hillocks, who had come to township curriculum meetings to speak on the process approach to writing. These speakers had some influence on her since she was interested in emphasizing revision. She liked the process approach in general but combined it with a traditional approach that fit her situation. This was due to the scheduling which limited her use of the literature and reading areas of language arts.

Carol noted emphatically in an interview that the most important ingredient for a good writing atmosphere was an open, relaxed class where students could feel trust. Brainstorming, she also felt, was a factor as well, in that it helped everyone see that all ideas had merit and could be used. In that way everyone could contribute. During my observations, brainstorming was used a great deal to bring about desired results in both planning sessions and group editing sessions (see Appendix B-1).

She explained that her lesson plans were carefully made, partly because she said she did not wish to infringe on another teacher's area. She chose different stories she had found and used them to illustrate various points she wished to make. The stories chosen were usually strong characterizations, since she felt students could work with these kinds of stories more easily. Two of the stories she chose were "The Bet" by Chekhov and "The Sniper" by O'Flaherty. After the children had read the stories, Carol asked them to write a topic sentence which had to be backed by evidence found in the story. She guided them strongly

at first with brainstorming sessions for ideas and handouts which helped them expand their writing.

Mini-lessons were also carefully planned, she emphasized, to help focus on topic sentences for single paragraphs at first and later for multi-paragraph essays. Other lessons were used for word choice, verb tense, use of verbs, and transitional devices, to name a few.

Like Bencal (1984), Carol felt that revision was the most important of all the writing stages and probably the most difficult to teach. She noted good writers felt the more effort they put in the better their writing was, while weak writers put anything down and considered it done. They looked at it only as an assignment.

Carol felt it would take about four months for revision to become a natural part of the writing process for students. She introduced revision strategies with the use of brainstorming and by having students put down ideas any way at first. After they started to write their topic sentence, students were divided into teams, usually of two or three persons. The members of one editing team were together all year and worked with editing sheets. These editing sheets were really checklists for the editor to use to help his or her partner (see Appendix B-3). Starting with reading the paragraph aloud, the editor had fifteen steps to go through which included checking for fragments and run-ons, weighing the topic sentence, looking at transitions and quotes, and checking the closing sentence. All students wanted to help their partners improve because they received extra grade points for a good editing job. Good team members stayed together and collaboratively worked on editing their paragraphs.

Carol wandered around the room to confer with editing groups and to exchange ideas by asking questions. She helped them to organize ideas, express ideas for topic sentences, follow with statement proofs, form clincher sentences, combine sentences, use transitional devices, read aloud, and use editing sheets. Team editing provided for reading aloud to another and for sharing ideas, as well as a chance to help another in editing as a learning experience. As the year progressed, the students were much more able to edit the papers of others, for they were working within their teams and in the whole class for final discussions. After papers were handed in, Carol selected a dozen or more at random from all her classes. The names were hidden and the papers were duplicated. This packet was passed out to all students for a session of group editing which took the whole period (see Appendix B-5). At first Carol directed the discussions, but after a while students began to lead the discussions about what was good about the paragraph or what needed attention. At first students did not want to admit that one of the papers read was theirs, but after a few months they asked to have their papers read aloud. The comments helped them to see what could be improved in the last opportunity to revise before the paragraph was graded. Carol used an evaluation sheet to help them understand how they were graded.

Carol seemed comfortable with the program. She felt the weakest link in her program was the scheduling. For this teacher the scheduling of writing, grammar, and spelling in one period and literature and reading in another was a source of great frustration. This limited what she could teach with writing. Another point was time; she felt

individualized attention could be improved if there was only more time. When I asked her how she would enjoy teaching writing with the use of computers, Carol expressed great interest, but said that the school did not have the equipment. There were not enough machines for everyone as yet, but she was hoping one day to be able to use them, even though she had never worked with students on them.

One of the strong points, however, in her program was the unusual stories she chose for focus. By using "The Bet" by Chekhov and "The Sniper" by O'Flaherty for emphasis on strong characterization, for example, Carol did not have to deal with those elements of the selections that were reserved for the literature classes. She chose these stories herself from those she read, and she changed stories every year. This meant all the worksheets, editing sheets, and evaluation sheets were changed as well. The work was new every year to her as well as the students. This helped to explain her cheerful enthusiasm and excitement in dealing with students and material. She also used brainstorming effectively to encourage students to think about the character analysis which was necessary to the writing.

At the beginning of the year Carol outlined her goals for writing and revision and how she planned to handle them. She followed through on her plans and achieved her goals using a process approach connecting writing to literature. At the end of the observation period she stated that the students observed had worked well and after six months were able to revise on their own as a natural part of their writing process.

Student Response and Perceptions

During observations the students in Carol's class seemed cooperative and responsive. For the most part they worked for her as she directed their activities. The noise level was controlled, even during the time of team editing conferences. The handouts given to the students guided them in the direction the teacher wanted, but the students were open about wanting the help and guidance. The discussion of ideas in brainstorming sessions helped them to formulate ideas and to see that their ideas had merit. They liked the use of editing sheets as they worked in small groups. During my observations they seemed to be good natured and responsive in a cooperative way. It was a relaxed atmosphere that they helped to create. They also commented in interviews that composition was one-third of their grade, and the points given for good editing efforts were a definite incentive. Grades were very important to these students.

Excerpts from the paragraphs that they wrote show some variation in the openings of the same theme, such as:

> "The sniper changed during the story from a person who enjoyed his role as a killer, to a man who saw the real tragedy of war. In the beginning the sniper was so wound up in killing people that he thought were the enemy that it was like a game to him."
>
> "'The lust of battle died in the sniper' as he realized he had killed his enemy. Since he was used to looking at

death, he became more secretive as he went on in his life. He was a hungry, isolated man who lived alone."

These were one paragraph essays. The closings or clincher sentences were also looked at closely. Some examples were:

"Curiosity took over his body. The sniper darted across the street to see his enemy. As the fighting went on down the street, the sniper realized the dead body on the roof belonged to his brother."

"The final blow occurred when he turned over the body only to find his dead brother. At the end of the story the sniper became disgusted with war when he saw the reality of his actions."

All the students felt revision was important, but some liked revising and others did not. Those who said they liked it didn't necessarily want to do it, but they saw its importance. One noted that it led to a better grade and a better product, in that order. Several commented that revision carried over to social studies but not to personal writing. A few writers seemed to hate it, proclaiming it was too much trouble. One honest young man said he was not good at revision because spelling and mechanics were hard for him. One group considered it fun to change things and used it not only in other subject areas but with personal writing as well. All students noted that Carol had been the teacher who taught them the most about revision.

PROFILE OF AN EIGHTH GRADE LANGUAGE ARTS TEACHER OF WRITING--LINDA

Room 104 in Broadview Middle School was close to the main office of the building. It was like the other rooms in the school with orange carpeting and 30 dark brown desk table and chair sets, giving an autumn look to the room. The desk sets were placed in five rows, six to a row. The teacher's desk was in the front of the room with a blackboard and a bulletin board filling the space behind her. The back of the room was a folding wall to another classroom. The side walls were brick, with the inside wall to the corridor covered by a long blackboard. The opposite wall was half brick and half window with a view that showed the back yard of a house as well as the back of the school where a pump and fence were prominent. There were low cabinets all along this wall and under the window. Three conference tables were available, one along the right side in the front and two more along the inside wall. In this class there were fifteen girls and six boys. Two days a week were devoted to writing as part of the regular language arts curriculum.

Linda's basic approach to writing was to use the process approach to writing which included planning, writing, and revision, but she also believed in a discovery approach which meant she wanted her students to discover this process for themselves without much guidance or handouts and worksheets from her. She was determined not to give any worksheets or handouts for she did not want to influence their decisions, but she did provide time and opportunity for them to write whatever they chose.

The periods used for writing at first started with a roll call for status report of where the students were in the writing process. This

idea was taken from the techniques of Atwell (1987). There also were some short mini-lessons, usually grammar reminders, at the beginning of the class if needed. Afterwards students were encouraged to begin working. For the rest of the period the teacher wandered around the room, asking and answering varied questions about the writing. Comments and exchanges never lasted very long. One exchange between teacher and a student was as follows:

Student: Mrs. -----, will you read this?

Teacher: (Reading) This is good, but your spelling needs work.

Student: It always needs work.

Teacher: I've put a check next to each line that has a spelling error. Just use the speller on the (computer) machine. You might also try to combine sentences here...and come up with a better close.

Student: What should I say?

Teacher: (In a gentle voice) You are going to have to figure that out. What is your topic about? Can you come up with a conclusion? I'd like to know more about it.

As time went on, however, the roll call was eliminated. Mini-lessons were continued on a need-to-know basis. The entire period was turned over to the writing process, with the teacher moving around the room, trying to see as many students as possible and lending support to any student who needed help. There was no particular plan she followed that was observable.

From observations made, Linda's approach to her students appeared gentle, flexible, and somewhat casual in her attitudes about writing.

She was soft-spoken and permissive. She expressed a desire to individualize her program for each student and wanted them to have the freedom of discovery in the writing process for themselves.

Because Linda had gone back for her Master's degree the previous year, she was familiar with the Graves's text, Writing: Teachers and Children at Work (1983) and had used his writing techniques in her language arts classes for her Master's project. Now she wanted to add techniques suggested by Atwell (1987) to her program but did not know if these would be successful. In her language arts classes, writing was done on Thursdays and Fridays, while spelling and grammar were covered the first three days of the week.

Linda was knowledgeable about various theories of writing when she discussed them in an interview and she felt she followed them, to a degree. She also felt, however, that these theories had to be adapted to an individual temperament, an individual classroom, or an individual situation. "There is no recipe...no magic formula,..." she said.

To create a writing atmosphere, Linda commented that she displayed work from other children from magazines or books to show what was possible. She asked students to bring writing materials and kept individual writing folders in the classroom. Dictionaries and other resources were made available. She showed them several ways to stimulate ideas for writing, such as classified ads and clustering.

Even though Linda wrote lesson plans for the other parts of the language arts program, for the days when the class was writing, she made no lesson plans. She "went with the flow." She tried some mini-lessons and kept them short in length. Most of them were on grammar reminders.

She did not feel the open time should be planned. Students were to use the time to write, but there were no particular directions given and no assignments given in writing. During the class observation periods she moved around the room, going to the individual students, to answer questions. Sometimes students came to her to ask questions about their writing. Suggestions were given to each writer to help him or her improve the piece he or she was working on. Questions came up about focus, organization, and word choice, as well as other writing concerns. The teacher admitted she felt a need to guide students toward choice of topics more than either Graves or Atwell recommended and tried to watch herself on this matter. When Linda had to follow the curriculum to be sure that descriptive paragraphs were taught and written, however, she returned to a traditional teacher-directed way of presenting the material with handouts and worksheets (see Appendix C). Ordinarily she did not use any handouts because she said she hated to try to influence their writing. In this instance, however, she felt she had to return to a traditional mode when teaching the descriptive paragraph from the curriculum. She gave rules for writing and did some brainstorming with them. These sessions seemed productive and students were responsive, but later their behavior and noise level began to increase when they were to follow through on writing.

This teacher commented that "revision...is the most difficult and the most important." But she admitted that she didn't really know how to teach revision and did not know how to make it a natural part of the writing process. She also admitted she placed no particular stress on the importance of revision in her classroom. As noted by Sommers

(1978), revision was perceived as a separate stage at the end of the writing process, more like a proofreading exercise. She did not know any students who liked to revise; some were just more willing to revise than others. By the end of the observation period she concluded in an interview that the Atwell techniques--"group share" and conference center tables--had not worked well for her. She saw no relationship between good student writers and poor student writers in the way they revised or didn't revise.

Since Linda was not sure how to teach revision, the strategies she used were not necessarily planned as an aid to revising. She had mini-lessons about writing on every other line and reading aloud as a self-editing device, and she showed three stages of one written piece to reveal the stages from beginning to finished product. She usually used grades to promote revision; only by writing multiple drafts could a student improve his or her grade. Linda had a multi-draft plan the students had to follow. The first draft was a planning copy. When the student revised this, it was given to the teacher who put a check in the margin of each line where a mistake had to be corrected. Many of the mistakes to be corrected were surface and lexical errors. This is when it became apparent that her teaching of revision primarily emphasized proofreading. According to Bridwell (1980), surface and lexical errors are the lowest levels of corrections. The final copy was for a grade. She did not believe in grading writing, she said, but knew she had to do so, since it represented one-third of the final grade. There was no evaluation sheet given, but there were comments written on the returned final paper.

For revision it was observed that in the classroom she wandered around the room, conferring in the same way she worked with the students for writing. There was no great emphasis given to revision. Group share didn't work for her she said, "because of the way the room is set up. It wasn't not successful, but it wasn't done enough to make sure if it was successful." Conference table centers did not work well either. Students used the time to talk about other things rather than to confer about writing or editing.

The weakest part of her writing program, Linda admitted, was getting the students to revise or even to be able to recognize where the work needed to be revised. The students hated to revise, since they felt it was too much work. Often the teacher allowed students to do other work during writing periods or made deals with them about not revising if they did a careful job on the first draft. This may have indicated to the students that the teacher did not feel revision was important.

Linda, at the beginning of the year, was enthusiastically looking forward to her work in adding the Atwell techniques from In the Middle to the Graves program as an experiment for the year. As the year went on, however, she changed what she said when asked informally about the use of the Atwell suggestions. She denied even using them and said she used only the techniques of Graves. Later, she also admitted she had a hard time dealing with the noise level that came with the freedom she gave the students. She did not understand how students could write in the middle of all the noise, since she herself liked to write in quiet. Under observation, the writing time she gave students, however, seemed

unstructured and was often not necessarily used for writing purposes. In some ways this teacher was assigning writing, for writing was what students were supposed to do in the time allocated. Linda talked very knowledgeably about writing, but she had not yet accomplished in her classes what she said she wanted to do.

Student Response and Perceptions

In many ways, the students were quite relaxed and cooperative but were described as "volatile" by the teacher. Most worked in spurts since there was no pressure on them until the end of the quarter when a set number of writings were expected. For the last week of the quarter the teacher allowed them to write every day in order to catch up to the required number for that quarter. One quarter four were required; the next quarter five were to be handed in. Two of the four or five required pieces could be poems. Most wrote short paragraphs; several wrote longer stories now and then. The most productive response came during the time the students were able to use computers. The entire class was signed into the computer room for the month of January. Every Thursday and Friday during that time Linda's class was in the computer room. There were not enough machines for everyone, but in some instances students teamed up while other students preferred not to use the computers at all. On the machines, revision was easy to accomplish; spelling was corrected automatically, and it was easy to make changes in the text. Even non-productive students seem interested enough to write for the most part, and there was considerably less talking and movement around the room. Most student questions during the computer time,

however, had to do with the computers and how they worked, rather than revisions needed in writing. Some students worked with others for a team effort. Here is where production included several stories that had four or five chapters. Without any directions two students teamed up to write an eight-chapter narrative on the computer. It began:

> "The bored students were sitting in the class as Mrs. Weiner, the 6th grade math teacher, scratched numbers onto the chalkboard. A book fell to the ground but no one turned around to laugh. Everyone knew who dropped the book. Sam Drear, 'The Clutz.'"

The two students collaborated on the story and changed what they wished as they went along. On the computers they felt it was easy to do.

Another student used the computers to write narrative paragraphs and to correct it afterwards with the spelling aids available. He was a student with learning disabilities and did little regular classwork. However, the teacher felt the computers were good for him because "...at least he wrote <u>something</u>...." For example, this student, using the word processor, was able to produce the following story:

> "When I was sailing around the world I was looking for a pirate ship with real pirates on it, and stolen gold. The Queen of England asked me to go find the gold for her and she said that I would get half of it. I was off the coast of Australia when I saw the pirate ship. I fired a cannon ball and it hit the vessel so we went close to the ship...."

There was also a small group of students who either did not know how to use the computers or did not like to use them. These students were in a section of the small computer room at tables and wrote in long hand when they were working.

After the computers were no longer available, production dropped sharply according to the teacher. Student interest in writing dropped as well.

The teacher had a multi-draft plan students were to follow, with the first draft a planning copy where they were to write down their ideas in any way. Just getting their ideas down was important at first; in rewriting they could change any mistakes. A revised copy then was given to the teacher who checked the lines where mistakes were made before she returned it. Most of these were surface errors. Some students proofread as they went along. One student who was considered a good writer noted in an interview he didn't like to revise but felt he had to. Many felt revising was easier on a computer which had programmed aids to help them. Several chimed in that they hated to revise. Most felt that Linda had taught them something about revising, although some students had done editing in other grades. They knew the final copy was for a grade.

During the course of writing their drafts, students went to the teacher as much as she went to them. The follow through of this multi-draft system seemed to deteriorate somewhat during the year, especially after the use of computers stopped. Occasionally students had a good writing day, but they seemed to want to do other things during the writing period such as working on other subjects, talking, or

applying nail polish. Because of the noise an occasional student would be allowed to go to the room next door, which was empty at that time period, to write quietly. Some loudly proclaimed in class they would rather write at home. Others used some time to talk about reading one another's work, but they did not necessarily read the stories. The teacher noted "...able students who finish early have nothing to do. This is a drawback of this kind of program." At one session a student who loudly protested having to revise was allowed to skip that part of the writing process, which in turn caused others to protest as well. They wanted to skip it too. At times the noise level was quite high.

The weak part of this program as I observed it was that the students were not writing more. Interviews with some students also revealed that they regarded revision as work. It did not become a natural part of their writing process. The students did not feel they had to stay on task. Actually, because of mixed signals about the use of time from the teacher, the students did not seem to be encouraged to write.

PROFILE OF AN EIGHTH GRADE LANGUAGE ARTS TEACHER OF WRITING--SARAH

At the Meadowhill Junior High, room 102 was in the west wing of the one-story school which sprawled in all directions. Bright colors were everywhere in the hallways, but the classrooms were neutral in tones. Room 102 was no different, with tan walls and draperies. It did have some unusual features, however. At the front of the room was a small carpeted stage about 6 X 10 feet, and at the back was a folding wall which could be moved back to combine two rooms if needed. Blackboards

covered most of the walls, and large windows and bulletin boards covered the rest. There was no free wall space. There were five rows of desk chairs, with five chairs in each row. The teacher's desk and table were on one side of the room, and a conference table was along the other side of the room under the windows. In the back of the room to one side was a large cabinet of many open compartments which contained the various handouts available. These included not only mini-lessons, but reminders of what was expected of students, how to pick a topic, or how to choose the style of writing, as well as evaluation sheets for every kind of writing --narratives, poetry, essays, reports, and descriptive, persuasive, and expository paragraphs (see Appendixes D-1 and D-2).

There were 16 eighth grade students in the class. The students had assigned seats which they used at the beginning of each period. When they came into the room, they immediately picked out their folders, which were kept in the room, and went to their assigned seats. They had supplies which they were to use, such as different colored pens for writing and revising and spiral notebooks which enabled them to write on every other line. This made it easier for cutting and pasting or for revision in general.

When the period began, Sarah called a status-of-the-class roll call, at which time each student identified his or her current stage in the writing process. The teacher noted this and asked if anyone wanted a conference, or she commented about whom she felt she should see. If there was no mini-lesson, the students scattered, each to a favorite place to write. One pushed a desk chair into a corner; others were lying on their stomachs on the stage. Several girls collaborated on a

play while sitting in desk chairs in a circle; one boy liked to revise under the conference table. Positions changed every day and sometimes more than once. The noise level was low for the most part, but there were some conversations as well as work going on most of the time. Peer editing, however, which the teacher encouraged, did not happen often enough to suit Sarah.

The class period then was divided into segments. The first five to ten minutes were used for roll call and mini-lessons if needed. Twenty to thirty minutes for the planned open time were for planning, writing, and revision, for teacher conferencing, peer conferencing, and editing. Whatever time was left was for group share. Sometimes individual conferences displaced group share, which was supposed to be every day but which was not always done.

Through observation it was easy to see that Sarah's approach to her students was enthusiastic, warm, casual, and good-natured. She was also somewhat nervous and intense and was always searching for something better to help students improve their writing. The interaction between the eighth graders and Sarah appeared to be based on mutual trust and liking. She expressed a great desire to have them enjoy writing, and she was trying to give them everything she could materially and personally to make the workshop work for them. She believed in what she was doing so much that she decided to have writing workshop every day, fitting in spelling and grammar as needed, even though this was not according to the curriculum.

During interviews or in daily conversations Sarah was quite knowledgeable about various theories of writing and quite frank in

discussing what she had done before she encountered the process approach in writing. She was thoughtful about why and what she was doing because of her own research, and she realized she had only assigned writing before because she did not really know how to teach writing and revision. Therefore, for her Master's project she faithfully followed the Atwell (1987) techniques and used her book, In the Middle, as a constant guide. As she was preparing the materials for the workshop, she admitted she had found herself very reluctant to start, but she followed the step-by-step procedures very carefully, even borrowing specific ideas from the book until she saw how it worked before she used the materials she designed herself. Atwell's book, she felt, was an invaluable aid, giving many lesson ideas and guidelines to follow. There was also a list of possible mini-lessons to use.

When she finally summoned enough courage to begin, she discovered her students responded well. Her fears that students would not be able to pick their own topics or work in this open workshop manner were put to rest.

Before Sarah began the actual writing program, however, she took a survey on student feelings and attitudes about writing. This was for her own research and helped to guide her. A follow-up survey was done at the end of the school year as well to see if there was any change. She was much aware from these surveys of how her students responded and which areas of writing needed development. Her surveys revealed a significant increase in positive attitudes toward writing over the course of the year (see Appendix D-4).

In retrospect at a later interview, even though preparations for the workshop were carefully done, Sarah felt her lessons plans could have been better. Every day she jotted down what she planned for mini-lessons that lasted five to seven minutes if they were needed, wrote down the names of students she felt she should see, and scheduled the rest of the time for student planning, writing, conferencing, or group share (see Appendix D-3). First there was the daily status roll call, where each student announced at what stage in the process he or she was working. Mini-lessons might be given next. From there students dispersed to continue their work. There was planned open time for students to confer at conference tables about editing or ideas for writing. Most of the time the teacher used the time to confer individually. In one instance a conference with a student went along the following lines:

Student: Can we have one theme for our play? Like his first day of school, in high school, and then like what happens?

Teacher: O.K. but I have found that most kids cannot just start to write in script form. They usually have to write a story. Then they have to decide by labelling the parts which they want to be narrative; in other words, they'll give you the little explanation at the beginning of the scene. Then they have to decide which part they're actually going to write as interaction between characters, will it be dialogue, then action and so on. I think if you're going to attempt to turn it into a script, that's fine. But I think you need to go through and write the whole story

first.

Student: All right. And then should we see you because we don't know....

Teacher: Then see me. We're going to have to make a judgment. First of all does it fit a script; can it be made into a script? Some stories are very difficult to make into scripts.

Student: (Reads story).

Teacher: What you have there can be made into a script. You don't have to go much further with that. So you need to come up with some good conclusion to this, and it doesn't mean it has to end nicely, you know. It can be on a really negative note if that's what you choose. The problem is if you have a whole lot of incidents that he's involved in you're going to lose.... It is going to start to ramble. Maybe you should set up his first week of school and take him through that.

Student: For maybe a couple of months or something like that?

Teacher: Or you could maybe just end with him thinking about how he is going to deal with what's ahead. There are a lot of people who write open-ended scripts and stories to allow some discussion. Maybe you want to go that route. But you have to decide now for the script.

Conferences could last any length of time, depending on what the student needed. At the end of the period everyone congregated on the stage for group share, to hear what one student had written, to help with ideas if

one was stuck, to suggest changes in openings or closings or whatever was asked for by the student. Seeing errors in the writing showed signs of growth and, according to Kantor (1979), indicated the student was reaching for a higher level of understanding. Birnbaum (1982) noted that more proficient student writers were willing to volunteer more evaluative comments, both negative and positive, about their own writing as well. Group share and the enthusiasm it generated in this class were indications that growth was taking place.

Sarah felt perhaps some periods might have been better if her lesson plans had been better. She planned her daily periods for writing workshop as carefully as possible, but she felt that in a first attempt there were always some things that cropped up to be reinforced, redone, or rewritten. There was a routine to these writing days, but it was a goal of hers to develop specific lesson plans over the summer.

One early problem, she revealed in an interview, surfaced about the mini-lessons when she used too much time in presenting them; students began to complain they were missing too much writing time. Another problem was that at times when she prepared a mini-lesson she discovered the students were not dealing with that issue at that time and therefore tuned out during presentation.

During one observation period she organized a student rap session to hear their concerns about the writing program. They wanted short mini-lessons, on Mondays if possible, so interference with the writing would be minimal. They wanted mini-lessons kept to a minimum in number as well, even though some were from the grammar text used by all the English classes. As time went on, however, the teacher felt it became

more difficult to use the text because of time constraints, even though some mini-lesson assignments were taken from the text.

From her own research Sarah reached a goal in creating a writing atmosphere which came from Graves (1982), who felt a classroom atmosphere should be, in his own words, "...structured, yet encouraging and supportive, gaining trust of students (p. 8)." Sarah felt a creative atmosphere for writing should allow for the time and freedom to create, the opportunity to share, and a sense of trust among the students in the classroom. Part of this creative atmosphere might have been due to the fact that she gave them freedom to choose their own topics instead of assigning them. As a teacher she also felt she had to teach students how to revise because of its importance to writing. Therefore, she walked around the room to reinforce, to confer, and to offer advice. By showing continued interest and being aware all the time, this teacher noted that an atmosphere for continued interest in writing was created. It was an atmosphere that was structured yet gave freedom to work. There was also control that was both encouraging and supportive.

In an interview Sarah said that she considered revision to be the most important of the three stages of the writing process, and yet the most difficult to teach. The more she worked with the Atwell (1987) book, the more she realized she had never before actually taught revision. She had encouraged proofreading which students only used to correct surface mistakes such as punctuation or spelling. In working with the Atwell techniques, she felt she had learned what revision was and how to teach it. Therefore, since writing is rewriting, heavy

emphasis was placed on learning to revise in order to express ideas clearly. According to Bridwell (1980) the deeper levels of revision are open to students given the opportunity. In this instance the teacher gave them the opportunity and they responded well. Sarah noted that good writers found revision easier than poor writers. Poor writers needed much guidance to revise but did well in step-by-step directions. They struggled greatly on their own, however. According to Bridwell's study, revision may be a function of both fluency and motivation.

In actually teaching revision, Sarah again started with the suggestions from the Atwell book, even before the writing workshop began. The first instructions were on the use of the caret to add a word, the use of spider legs to add sentences, the use of asterisks to add paragraphs, and the use of cutting and pasting. Students were also instructed on the use of supplies they would need. Other steps of the revision process included underlining the first word of every sentence in a paragraph to become aware of how they started, counting the sentences in a paragraph or counting the words used, sentence combining, and the use of the supplies to make revisions. Mini-lessons were given on overused words to avoid, such as got and nice. Word choice became more important as the workshop continued. Leads were discussed and various types--action, dialogue, and reaction--were tried with the same story. Sarah followed through every day with each student individually or in a group, but mostly with individual conferences. Group share was also a good way for revision to emerge. The idea of peer and teacher exchange, however, caused early tension among the students, who did not want to read their writings aloud at first. Yet it proved to be a way

of clarifying ideas, for when writers read their work aloud, they hear it and see it with new eyes. After students saw its usefulness, it was often requested. The teacher commented, however, that students still did not help each other individually in editing and revising enough and that peer conferencing at times turned into just talking.

In an interview Sarah said the weakest point in teaching revision was that students do not really like to revise and any teacher has to fight a natural opposition to it, even when the students realize its worth. However, by constantly following through on the teaching of revision, after about six months Sarah felt that revision had become a natural part of the students' writing process. They automatically revised either recursively or after they finished each draft.

The strongest point in the teaching of revision was the teacher, who wanted to facilitate change in the classroom and worked to accomplish that change. At the beginning of the year Sarah said she wanted to facilitate change in her students and their attitude and approach to writing by using Atwell's techniques for a writing workshop. Her experiment was a success, for the results from her surveys--pre and post comparisons--were both positive and pleasing to her, and her students gained in writing and revision techniques as she had never experienced before.

Student Response and Perceptions

Sarah's students responded to her by being receptive, cooperative, and relaxed about writing. They gave her trust and showed confidence in what she was trying to teach them. Most were quite responsible. In her survey, Sarah found that students felt people learned to write to communicate and to express their feelings. Students also felt that people learned to write by practicing, from a teacher, and in school. To write well, students felt one must use imagination, planning, and thinking. They had to write about own their ideas, express themselves freely, and have a positive attitude.

During this observation period, the class was eager to write. In a rap session they expressed a desire for short mini-lessons on only one day a week so they would have more time to write. This sentiment to have more time to write came out clearly in the survey as well. They liked bouncing ideas off one another in peer conferences or in group share. They enjoyed sharing their writings with others and eventually reading them aloud. They liked the freedom to write what they wanted at their own pace with no pressures, instead of having assigned writing. They did not want to give up their writing time, for even during a time when eighth grade research papers had to be done they still loudly demanded certain days set aside for the writing workshop.

The students seemed to feel comfortable working in the classroom in a routine way with planning, writing, and revision. Another positive aspect of this writing atmosphere they helped create was the group share, which they felt brought them all closer together. It was also

obvious to them that the teacher cared, and much of her enthusiasm carried over to students. This was ascertained by individual interviews with students as well as by the rap session and observations.

They viewed revision as important and used it in writing class and for social studies and research papers, but they did not use it for other writing such as personal letters. One student commented that "it brought out the potential of a piece." Still another said, "Revising is easier because you are correcting and changing instead of starting from scratch." Their attitude about revision was cheerful and responsive. All seemed to enjoy the writing workshop and the relaxed atmosphere, but the teacher felt some writers were not very productive. The teacher commented that they socialized to some degree. Therefore, they did not do as well because they did less writing. To some of these students, she noted, revision was considered work. Some pieces were abandoned because they did not know what they really wanted to say or how to change them to improve them. These usually were not shown to the teacher or any peer, but the teacher was aware of them when the pieces were in process.

The revision process went on at all times and was observed at all stages of writing. Because mini-lessons in revision were carefully presented before writing ever began, most students constantly referred to them until use became automatic. Most followed through with revision techniques as soon as ideas began to emerge in writing as part of a regular routine. As one student said, "Stories are fun to write; revision is always needed to finish it." The students agreed that writing is rewriting.

Because group share triggered ideas for other stories, for revision needed, and allowed the students to seek help for openings, paragraphs, endings, or other specific elements, it became a regular part of the workshop, as recommended in the Atwell program.

The weakest part of the program for students, the teacher noted in an interview, was the constant need to come up with ideas for writing. Even with techniques such as clustering, students found it difficult to come up with topics they could develop. Time was also a constraint. They wanted more time to write.

Students also felt and said that the strongest point of the class was the freedom to write--commercials, plays, narratives, exposition, description, poems. Anything they wanted to express was allowed in order to encourage independent thought and writing. They produced on their own as a response to this freedom. One young man came up with the idea to write a "Journal of a Wolf," the diary of a boy who turned into a werewolf and the adventures he had until caught. His writing began:

> "May 9.--I woke this morning with a strange sweat and then, when I went to brush my teeth I noticed they were a slight reddish color. Boy, did I feel weird."

The idea for this four-page narrative was born when he read that those who had been accused years ago of being werewolves usually had heavy eyebrows that met in the center over the bridge of the nose. Since his eyebrows met in the same fashion, his creative fantasy did the rest. The use of a diary for the author's point of view gave an interesting and different aspect to his story which allowed for a reportial style of writing.

Another narrative paragraph came from one boy as part of a four-page piece about the camp he had attended:

> "Parasailing was in the schedule the day before we were bound to leave. Since this would be the first time doing this, I was really excited and a little scared. After hooking me into a parachute harness, the boat took up slack on the rope and I was ready to become airborne. As I ran along the beach, the boat picked up speed and finally I was free, nothing to hold onto, nothing to do, except look. It was a beautiful sight, to gaze over a lake from 100 feet high."

As he worked he wrote slowly, revising as he went along. After it was finished, he revised again. Because this event had been something he had enjoyed, he was able to pick a topic that had appeal and which enabled him to write freely.

A descriptive paragraph was the choice of another student who had been to the Virgin Islands. She closed with "At night the ravishing color of the sunset fills the sky, ending a wondrous day in the U.S. Virgin Islands."

The teacher and her program were also considered a strength by the students. Revision was considered important because of how ideas could be turned into finished products. All students revised as part of the process taught. Teacher conferences and peer conferring were seen as aids to better writing. One student echoed the sentiment of many when he said, "Writing workshop is really great."

COMPARISON OF THE THREE TEACHERS

The data reduction chart was an important tool in making the comparisons between teachers and made it easier to see certain things they had in common, as well as what they did differently. The same categories that were on the chart were used to report the similarities and differences in this section.

One thing that should be reported is the empathy I felt toward Sarah and her class. Bogdan and Biklen (1982) classify this as disciplined subjectivity. To be able to share the feelings of the teacher is a source for reflection which is so important to a researcher. Sarah bent over backwards to be helpful with comments she made, insights she had, and background she wished to share. She enjoyed having an observer in her class to share in her great experiment and gladly supplied copies of almost everything she did that could be useful to my study. As a researcher herself, she was totally sympathetic to my needs. The class too was very responsive to the situation, and individuals at times even asked for help when the teacher was busy. After the observation period was over in March, the class gave a party to show their appreciation for the advice given, although it had been minimal. Even today these same students will rush over to say hello whenever they are in the same area. In contrast Carol's class seemed to ignore the fact that someone was taping their conversations and comments, although they continued to work. They were pleasant but uninvolved. Linda's class not only ignored me but did not want their conversations taped because often they were not on task.

In their general approach to children these three teachers were similar in some ways and dissimilar in others. All were gentle and sincere with a sense of humor. They obviously liked their students and worked with them so that learning could take place. Linda and Sarah were rather flexible, but with different ideas about classroom control and influence; Carol appeared to be less flexible because of the writing program she set up but she was very responsive to her students. Sarah was very intense in her desire to find new ways to help the writing workshop and the writers.

Linda and Sarah were quite knowledgeable about writing theories because they each had been working on Master's projects. Their philosophy of writing was based upon the techniques of Graves and Atwell. Carol was not as knowledgeable but liked the three stages of the process approach to writing.

They all tried to create a comfortable writing atmosphere in their classrooms. Carol felt being relaxed was most important to creating a writing atmosphere. She wanted trust from her students. She planned her lessons carefully and assigned what she wanted them to do. Her focus was only on literature as opposed to the other two teachers who gave free choice of topic. She designed all the worksheets and handouts. She led the class in the direction she chose in a structured way but gave them some freedom to write, using her guidelines which mostly reflected proofreading concerns. Usually her students wrote only one paragraph at a time, while Sarah's and Linda's students were free to write whatever they chose and could make it as long as they wanted. Carol's students responded to this for the most part by using their time

well and working, for children help to create the atmosphere of a classroom as well. On the other hand Linda was unstructured, relaxed, and permissive which made it difficult for her to control the class. She "went with the flow" and made no general preparations for writing. Because she did not want to influence their writing, students received no handouts or worksheets. This was a major point of difference between Linda and the other two teachers. She wanted them to "discover" writing on their own without teaching them the skills they needed. However, it seemed to the observer it was hard for the students to know how best to write and revise.

Sarah had a structured, unstructured class--an open, but supportive atmosphere where students worked at their own pace. This class was in contrast to Carol's class. Sarah encouraged them to write new and different things and to share these with others, but they had complete freedom to choose their own topics. Open time was planned for conferencing and seeing individual students. She was always aware of what the students were doing. This seemed to be a class where everyone, with few exceptions, seemed to enjoy writing. They helped in large measure to make this class work through group share, conferencing, and work in general. Another big difference in comparing these teachers is that Sarah was the only one who believed so strongly in what she was doing that she decided to have writing workshop every day, fitting in spelling and grammar as needed, even though this was not according to the curriculum.

Each of these teachers viewed revision as important, but how they taught it was very different. Carol thought revision was the most

important of the writing processes, although her teaching of revision tended to emphasize narrower concepts of editing. She worked with established editing teams who worked with her editing sheets as guidelines. She had many strategies to teach as mini-lessons. Further discussion for editing purposes was done by the whole class for sharing. Revision became a natural part of the writing process for her students within four to six months.

Linda felt revision was the most important of all the writing stages, but the most difficult to teach. In fact, she admitted she was not sure how to teach revision. This came as a surprise since she seemed so well versed in the Graves and Atwell theories. Both of these models supply many revision techniques. The needed strategies were already in her teaching repertoire, but she was not aware of this and of what the results could be in teaching revision. What she was teaching was really how to proofread. She felt no students liked to revise, but some were more willing to do so than others. She saw no way to help students make revision a natural part of writing.

Sarah, on the other hand, felt revision was writing or writing was rewriting, and she said this so frequently that it became something of a class slogan. She taught revision strategies before the class even started writing. Using the techniques of Atwell, she followed through with group share, conferencing, and self editing. She felt, however, that students don't really want to revise and the teacher has to fight a natural opposition to it. Perhaps this might only occur at this grade level. Once in high school or in college students who have made

revision a natural part of their writing process may find writing assignments an easier task than those who have not.

The efforts of these three teachers to teach students to revise were varied. The instructions they gave on overworked words, combining sentences, putting in details to support ideas, and other revision tactics were not always used. To teach something does not always mean the student will automatically respond, for at times the student may reject advice given. Students who have not been taught to revise do not seem to look for ways of changing their text. They seem to look for and correct surface and lexical mistakes and feel the job is done. The following chart illustrates how instruction can affect the revision process by showing the first draft of one student for each teacher, what the teacher did to help the revision process, and the second draft of the written piece with the changes made (see Figure 2). Sarah's and Carol's students made changes at all levels of revision according to Bridwell. Linda's students usually seemed comfortable with surface and lexical corrections, with a few exceptions (see the following chart).

Both Carol and Sarah outlined what their program was to be at the beginning of the year. Carol was a traditional teacher using short stories to implement her program. Sarah, at the other extreme, was being experimental in a workshop situation. Both worked at what they planned to do and met with success. The results for both were pleasing. Sarah's survey (see Appendix D-4) indicated very positive responses from students. More important, Carol's and Sarah's students benefitted by their efforts to improve the entire process of writing for them, but

Figure 2

Comparison of Student Work
Before and After Instruction

First Draft	What Teacher Showed for Revision	Second Draft
Ryan "Everyday there was something new, whether it being crawling through a thirty foot long cement pipe that was a foot and a half wide, or getting fifteen people over a fifteen foot high wall. Every night there was 'club' dinner, and partying, like I said I had a really good time since there were girls."	Sarah - mini-lesson on varying language and making each sentence rich in detail. Bridwell: Level 2 lexical revisions and level 5 sentence revisions	Ryan "Whether it be crawling through a thirty foot long pipe that was a foot and a half wide or lifting and pulling fifteen people over a fifteen foot wall, everyday there was something new.(5) Every night there was 'club' dinner, and partying. Because of the girls, I had a really good time especlally compared to my last camp."(2)(5)
Josh "...My family and I were deep sea fishing and there were no bites all day and then suddenly there was a shark on the line and he started pulling on the boat and I almost fell in but the guy held on to me and the guy almost fell in the water but he didn't..."	Linda - individual conference on putting in details and separating sentences Bridwell: Level 1 surface revisions and level 5 sentence revisions	Josh "...My family and I were deep sea fishing and there were no bites all day.(1) Then suddenly there was a huge bite.(6) It must have been a Great White Shark on the line.(5) He started pulling the boat.(1) I almost fell in, but the guide held on to me..."(5)
Lisa "...After he killed the other sniper, he changed. He felt remorse and guilt. He became bitten by remorse. In the end, the sniper felt very guilty and remorseful for having killed the other sniper, whom he found out was his own brother..."	Carol - class discussion on theme points out repetitions and lack of details to support quotation from story and and other statements made Bridwell: Level 5 sentence revisions Level 6 multisentence revisions	Lisa "...After he killed the other sniper, he changed. He became bitten by remorse at the sight of the shattered mass of his fallen enemy.(5) He was tired of war.(6) In the end he found he had killed his own brother..."(5)(6)

especially the process of revision. The method that they used was different, but in each case their students seemed to learn the process.

Linda seemed to be very knowledgeable about theories, but actually in her classroom she did not follow them. At the the beginning of the year she was going to try to combine the Atwell model with the Graves model already in use as an experiment, but when asked later about the use of the Atwell techniques, she denied that she even used them. In general she wanted to use a discovery method of writing which included the revision stage but taught no strategies that would help them discover what they should do. She gave out no handouts or worksheets, she claimed, so as not to influence them, but when she had to teach the descriptive paragraph, she was well-organized, instructive, gave out handouts and worksheets, had brainstorming sessions, and followed through on their work. It was a marked contrast to the normal disorder. When asked why she had done so much for this particular unit, she replied that it was in the curriculum and had to be taught. She gave mixed signals to the students about writing and revision and how important they were. In spite of all this, some writing was done. Grades still were given out. The class was unruly at times and she called them "volatile;" perhaps this is why so little was done by the teacher to teach writing and revision.

In Chapter 5 the findings and implications of these case studies will be discussed.

CHAPTER 5. IMPLICATIONS AND FINDINGS

The case study methodology gave me the opportunity to document the activities of three eighth grade classes and their teachers in the area of writing and revision.

Five questions motivated this study:

1. How do teachers view the revision process? What purposes and values does it have for them and their students?

2. How do teachers help their students to make revisions and to learn to revise effectively? What kinds of classroom lessons, activities, or processes do teachers use to teach revision and how much time is allocated to it?

3. What is the relationship between what the teacher believes about revision and how he or she is teaching revision?

4. How do students perceive revision and what do they do when they revise? How do they perceive their teacher's approach to revision or the instruction they receive?

5. What are the implications of the findings of this study for teaching and teacher education in the area of writing?

In order to meet these objectives, three junior high school teachers of language arts were observed regularly for six months to see how they taught revision and how students responded to the revision techniques taught. The previous chapter presented the three teachers as case studies which showed how they and their students looked at revision. This chapter presents conclusions which will answer the questions which have guided this study.

1. How Do Teachers View the Revision Process? What Purposes and Values Does It Have for Them and Their Students?

The teachers in this study viewed the revision process as the most important of all the writing stages and the most difficult to teach. Sarah and Carol spent a great deal of time in teaching the revision process because they felt it was the backbone of the writing process. Because of this belief they recognized that written pieces are not finished until they have been edited, since the potential meaning of the writing may not be obtained until it is rethought. In her checklist for editing, Carol indicated that she felt revision started with checking for spelling, punctuation, fragments, and run-ons. The topic sentence had to be an opinion written so that it could be backed up with statements of proof from the story. A quotation was also to be included from the selection. Verb tenses were checked, as well as the two transitional words required. Each sentence in the paragraph had to start with a different word. The emphasis was on surface level corrections for the most part. It was largely an exercise in proofreading.

Sarah, following Atwell's (1987) lead, saw revision at all levels from surface to textual. Some mini-lessons were on simple items such as overworked words; others were on various leads possible for story openers. She discussed expressions that would make students' writing more vivid and succinct, as well as ways of changing the function of stories or essays. Shifting the order of sentences or paragraphs was common. Like Calkins (1986), she believed that revision was rewriting

and thinking. Its purpose was to help the writer realize the most exact interpretation of the thoughts that he or she wished to express, and its value was in the thinking processes that must be applied. Like Calkins, she felt that it was an intimate learning experience. But getting students to revise is to overcome the natural opposition of students, even when they see its importance. Both of these teachers commented on the resistance of students to the revision process. All three of the teachers noted it was difficult to teach some students to see the need for reworking and improving what they have written. Since Linda was not sure how to teach the revision process, she was not aware of some of the teaching strategies she used, but she still recognized the importance of this stage of writing. She knew what revision was because she wrote herself, but she was not able to teach it. She was primarily teaching her students to proofread.

2. How Do Teachers Help Their Students To Make Revisions and To Learn To Revise Effectively? What Kinds of Classroom Lessons, Activities, or Processes Do Teachers Use To Teach Revision and How Much Time Is Allocated to It?

These three teachers helped their students make revisions and to revise effectively by teaching them the strategies needed, such as starting each sentence with a different word, combining sentences, matching verb tenses, watching word choice, obtaining a clear focus, and organizing the material, to name only a few. These techniques were not only taught, but Carol and Sarah monitored the students to be sure that the revision techniques were actually being used. These techniques were

used constantly in individual conferences, group share, team editing, or peer conferences until students were able to revise as a natural part of their writing process. For Linda and Carol computers made writing and revision easier, even if only for a short while, for students were able to correct surface errors such as spelling. The teaching of revision techniques, however, might enable the student to see the need for improvement and change in all levels of revising from surface errors to textual as set forth by Bridwell (1980). Therefore, if writing periods were carefully planned, even when open time was allocated for writing, students would be able to have more time for writing. Writing and revision can be used across subject areas, and the focus on writing in a language arts class is more important than homework. Some kind of control exerted by the teacher would allow all children the opportunity to work and create. How to use time to the best advantage may be a fine line a teacher has to tread and may only come with practice in some cases.

Teachers can teach writing and revision if they know what to do, but they also need support for their efforts and a spirit of risk-taking. The teachers who are successful at teaching writing and revision are hardworking individuals, not "superstars," who try to implement change and improvement in their classrooms. The Atwell (1987) model provided Sarah with a guide for such change.

There was no exact amount of time set aside for revision in these classrooms, since revising was automatically done in a recursive pattern all the time or at the end of each written piece.

3. What Is the Relationship between What the Teacher Believes about Revision and How He/She Is Teaching Revision?

The teachers of this study were knowledgeable about various writing theories but did not necessarily use them in the classroom. They often adapted theories to their own needs which at times took the heart out of the theory, such as with Linda's half-hearted attempt to use the group share and conference table centers. Theories can provide impetus for great excitement and enthusiasm in the classroom, such as with Carol using the process approach in combination with literature to create a desired effect. A problem arises, however, when a teacher is not clear about what revision is and does not know how to teach it. They may stress its importance but only "assign" it.

Various factors beyond the control of the teacher may also have an effect on teacher decisions in the classroom. In all three of the case studies, scheduling affected what these teachers decided to do and how they were to teach the three stages of the writing process. All three taught grammar, spelling, and writing in one period of language arts, while literature and reading were taught by someone else. Each teacher handled the situation differently. Sarah made writing her daily activity and tried to integrate spelling and grammar into the writing program. Linda chose to use two days a week to have students discover writing on their own but had problems when quarterly changes took out some students and brought in others new to her program. Carol chose to link writing to literature two days a week, but she had to do so in such

a way that there would be no interference for the regular literature classes with another teacher.

4. How Do Students Perceive Revision and What Do They Do When They Revise? How Do They Perceive Their Teacher's Approach to Revision or the Instruction They Receive?

Students for the most part did not like to revise and a natural opposition had to be overcome. This was noted by all three of the teachers in this study. Students learned to revise, however, by being taught to revise. They continued to revise when the teacher followed through to be sure this was what they were doing. After a certain period of time--four to six months, as seen in Carol's and Sarah's classrooms--students were able to make revision a natural part of their writing process.

When they revised, there were various strategies that were used. Many revised as they went along, sentence by sentence or paragraph by paragraph, constantly changing, constantly looking for a better way to say what they mean. Others waited until the entire piece was completed before starting the revisions. Those who enjoyed the editing aspect did so for various reasons: (a) they liked to change things, (b) they liked to improve the potential of their writing, and (c) they liked better grades. There also seemed to be connections between good writers and a willingness to revise and poor writers and a lack of motivation to revise.

These students were able to perceive their teacher's approach to writing and all of its stages by the way the teacher behaved. If

teachers like Sarah and Carol constantly were working to help them stay on task by conferring, suggesting, or guiding in many ways, students understood that the teacher felt writing and especially revision were important. Therefore, they treated it as important as well. If a good teacher like Linda did not make them revise or allowed other subject areas to interfere with revising strategies, she was signaling the students that writing and revision techniques were not important. Students took instruction seriously when they knew the teacher was serious about it, expecting them to learn revision techniques and use them. Students did not seem to revise or did not seem to enjoy revising unless they were taught the skills needed to revise.

5. What Are the Implications of the Findings of This Study for Teaching and Teacher Education?

In-service programs are needed to emphasize the process approach to writing and to stress revision techniques heavily. Clearly revision techniques need to be defined because it would seem that although many English teachers have knowledge that would help students learn to revise they need to put that knowledge into use.

Lesson plans that include a plan for what to accomplish each writing day are important. Lesson plans would not only help the teacher to see what had been done, what needed to be done, but also who needed attention. A status-of-the-writer daily call might also be a good idea for the same reason. It helps to keep the teacher in touch with each student's progress. It also helps to establish the tone of the class and indicates to the student that the work is important.

To have a teacher just assign writing and editing limits the student writer. What might be needed are revision strategies and conferences with students about their writing. To follow through, either individually or in group share, with peers as well as with the teacher gives the student a greater audience. Perhaps peer coaching or allowing students to observe writing in other classes might be tried. If the teacher does not follow through, however, she or he will be signaling that writing and especially revision are not important.

Computers have been used as a tool in writing, but the automatic programs that correct spelling only are not enough. Newer programs coming out analyze writing by telling the writer how many ands there are or how many variations there are in the beginning of sentences. They cannot, however, take the place of a writer knowing how to change to improve or to edit and think through a piece of writing to develop the real meaning of what he or she wishes to say.

Revision can be taught at all school levels. As soon as a student can write, it might be possible to teach that student to revise. It is a thinking process that is needed at all levels of learning.

Teacher education might benefit if it included courses on how to teach writing and revision, as well as reading or literature. Since writing and learning have been more and more connected by research, it would seem that writing should begin to have a higher priority in teacher education plans. Writing and revision techniques should be included in a required course for all education students since writing is required in all academic areas to communicate ideas.

A LIMITATION OF THIS STUDY

The major limitation of this study was the scheduling of the observations. The morning hours turned out to be the best for observing, but two of the teachers--Carol and Linda--taught writing as part of their regular language arts classes, and both used Thursday and Friday of each week for that purpose. This complicated matters, for with Carol, projects lasted two to three weeks, and it was necessary to see these projects through from beginning to end. Therefore, I could not use alternate weeks for observations between the two, and sometimes it seemed a long time between classroom visits. It would have been better if I had been able to observe on alternate weeks between these two classrooms.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The case study methodology is a good vehicle for naturalistic research. It allows one to begin with broad questions which then tend to narrow to more complex questions and issues for future research. Sometimes even the original questions change. My main concern or emphasis has been on the teacher of writing in the middle grades. I chose this area because so little research has been done and I felt there was much to learn. Since revision has to be taught before it can be learned, I have discovered as part of this project that there often is a difference between how a teacher perceives revision and how he or she teaches it. More research needs to be done in this area, for I have only scratched the surface. Another possibility for future research

might be on how to teach a specific revision skill since I concentrated on a broad view of the revision process. Specific research on the skill of conferencing and its effect on student writing, for example, would be interesting to conduct. Other aspects that might be worthy of study are the writing and revising of high school students and the resistance to revision as noted bt Carol and Sarah. I also feel that more emphasis should be placed on the teacher's role in the classroom. My study strongly suggests that teacher attitude has a great deal to do with what is taught and how it is taught and learned. The climate of the classroom could be the focus for several studies. How do teachers establish a good classroom climate? Is it related to their personality? Is it because they are upbeat or purposeful? What might be revealed in a study of teachers who have been doing this same kind of teaching for longer periods of time than those in the present study? The possibilities are endless, for there is still so much to learn about the process of revision and how it works.

REFERENCES

Applebee, A.N. (1984). Contexts for learning to write. (pp.183-189). Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Applebee, A.N. (1986). Problems in process approaches: Toward a reconceptualization of process instruction. In A.R. Petrosky and D. Bartholomae (Eds.), The teaching of writing (pp. 95-113). Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Applebee, A.N.; Langer, J.A.; Mullis, I.V.S. (1986). Writing trends across the decade, 1974-1984 (Report No. 15-W-01). Washington, D.C.: National Assessment of Educational Progress.

Atwell, N. (1987). In the middle. Upper Montclair, N.J.: Boynton/Cook.

Beach, R. (1979, May). The effects of between-draft teacher evaluation versus student self-evaluation on high school students' revising of rough drafts. Research in Teaching of English, 13, 111-119.

Beach, R. (1986, February). Demonstrating techniques for assessing writing in the writing conference. College Composition and Communication, 37, 56-65.

Beach, R. and Bridwell, L.S. (1984). Factors influencing self-assessing and revising by college freshmen. In R. Beach and L.S. Bridwell (Eds.), New directions in composition and research (Ch. 7). New York: Guilford.

Bencal, C.E. (1984). Developing independence: Sixth grade. In N. Gordon (Ed.), Classroom experiences: The writing process in action (Ch. 4). Exeter, N.H.: Heinemann.

Birnbaum, J.C. (1982, October). The reading and composing behavior of selected fourth- and seventh-grade students. Research in the Teaching of English, 16, 241-278.

Bolarsky, C. (1981, March). The eleven functions of revision. Paper presented at the meeting of Conference on College Composition and Communication, Dallas, Tx.

Bogdan, R.C. and Biklen, S.K. (1982). Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bridwell, L.S. (1980, October). Revising strategies in twelfth grade students' transactional writing. Research in the Teaching of English, 14, 197-222.

Bruton, D.L. (1985). Toward a definition of written fluency: Connecting product, process, and theory. Unpublished dissertation, Athens, Ga.: University of Georgia.

Butler-Nalin, K. (1984). Revising patterns in students' writing. In A.N. Applebee (Ed.). Contexts for learning to write (Ch. 8). Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Calkins, L.M. (1980, December). Notes and comments: Children's rewriting strategies. Research in the Teaching of English, 14, 331-341.

Calkins, L.M. (1983). Lessons from a child. Exeter, N.H.: Heinemann.

Calkins, L.M. (1986). The art of teaching writing. Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.

Carroll, J.A. (1986). Process into product: Teacher awareness of the writing process affects students' written products. In R. Beach

and L.S. Bridwell (Eds.), New directions in composition research (Ch. 16). New York: Guilford.

Chew, C. (1985). Instruction can link reading and writing. In J. Hansen, T. Newkirk and D. Graves (Eds.), Breaking ground: Teachers relate reading and writing in the elementary school (Ch. 16). Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.

Clay, M.M. (1982, January). Learning and teaching writing: A developmental perspective. Language Arts, 59, 65-70.

Daly, J.A. and Miller, M.D. (1975). Apprehension of writing as a predictor of message intensity. Journal of Psychology, 89, 175-177.

Daly, J.A. and Wilson, D.A. (1983, December). Writing apprehension, self-esteem, and personality. Research in the Teaching of English, 17, 327-341.

Emig, J. (1971). The composing processes of twelfth graders. Research Report No. 13. Urbana, Il.: National Council of Teachers of English.

Flower, L. and Hayes, J.R. (1981, October). The pregnant pause: An inquiry into the nature of planning. Research in the Teaching of English, 15, 229-243.

Flower, L.; Hayes, J.R.; Carey, L.; Schriver, K.; and Stratman, J. (1986, February). Detection, diagnosis, and the strategies of revision. College Composition and Communication, 37, 16-55.

Freedman, S. W. and Calfee, R.C. (1984, October). Understanding and comprehending. Written Communication, 1, 459-490.

Fulwiler, T. (1982). Teaching teachers to teach revision. In R.A. Sudol (Ed.), Revising: New essays for teachers of writing (Ch. 8). Urbana, Il.: National Council of Teachers of English.

Gage, J.T. (1986). The teaching of writing: Theory and practice. In A.R. Petrosky and D. Bartholomae (Eds.), The teaching of writing (pp. 8-29). Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Gere, A.R.; Schuessler, B.F., and Abbott, R.D. (1984). Measuring teachers' attitudes toward writing instruction. In R. Beach and L.S. Bridwell (Eds.), New directions in composition research (Ch. 18). New York: Guilford.

Glatthorn, A.A. (1982, October). Demystifying the teaching of teaching. Language Arts, 59, 722-725.

Goetz, J.P. and LeCompte, M.D. (1984). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research. New York: Academic Press.

Graves, D.H. (1975, Winter). An examination of the writing processes of seven-year-old children. Research in the Teaching of English, 9, 227-241.

Graves, D.H. (1978, May). We won't let them write. Language Arts, 55, 635-640.

Graves, D.H. (1979, March). What children show us about revision. Language Arts, 56, 312-319.

Graves, D.H. (1980, November-December). A new look at writing research. Language Arts, 57, 915-919.

Graves, D.H. (1981, February). Writing research for the eighties: What is needed. Language Arts, 58, 197-206.

Graves, D.H. (1982, February). How do writers develop? Language Arts, 59, 173-179.

Graves, D.H. (1983). Writing: Teachers and children at work. Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.

Graves, D.H. and Giacobbe, M.E. (1981, February). Questions for teachers who wonder if their writers change. Language Arts, 58, 197-206.

Haley-James, S.M. (1981, May). Revising writing in the upper grades. Language Arts, 58, 562-566.

Hansen, B. (1978). Rewriting is a waste of time. College English, 39, 956-960.

Hillocks, G., Jr. (1982, October). The interaction of instruction, teacher comment, and revision in teaching the composing process. Research in the Teaching of English, 16, 261-278.

Hillocks, G., Jr. (1986a). The writer's knowledge: Theory, research, and implications for practice. In A.R. Petrosky and D. Bartholomae (Eds.), The teaching of writing (pp. 71-94). Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Hillocks, G., Jr. (1986b). Research on written composition: New directions for teaching. Urbana, Il.: National Conference on Research in English/ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills.

Hull, G. (1987, February). The editing process in writing: A performance study of more skilled and less skilled college writers. Research in the Teaching of English, 21, 8-29.

Kantor, K.J. (1979, October). Appreciating children's writing.

Language Arts, 56, 742-746.

Kantor, K. J. (1984). Classroom contexts and the development of writing instructions: An ethnographic case study. In R. Beach and L.S. Bridwell (Eds.), New directions in composition research (pp. 72-94). New York: Guilford.

Lincoln, Y.S. and Guba, E.G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills, Ca.: Sage Publications.

Matsuhashi, A. (1981). Pausing and planning: The tempo of written discourse production. Research in the Teaching of English, 15 (2), 113-134.

Matsuhashi, A. (1982). Explorations in the real-time production of written discourse. In M. Nystrand (Ed.), What writers know: The language, process, and structure of written discourse. New York: Academic Press.

Matsuhashi, A. and Gordon, E. (1985). Revision, addition, and the power of the unseen text. In S.W. Freedman (Ed.), The acquisition of written language (pp. 226-249). Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Matsuhashi, A. (1987). Revising the plan and altering the text. In A. Matsuhashi (Ed.), Writing in real time: Modeling production process (pp. 197-223). Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Mischel, T. (1974, Winter). A case study of a twelfth grade writer. Research in the Teaching of English, 8, 303-314.

Mohr, M.M. (1984). Revision: The rhythm of meaning. Upper Monclair, N.J.: Boynton/Cook.

Monahan, B.D. (1984, October). Revision strategies of basic and competent writers as they write for different audiences. Research

In the Teaching of English, 18, 288-304.

Murray, D.M. (1978). Internal revision: A process of discovery. Research on composing: Points of departure. Urbana, Il.: National Council of Teachers of English.

Murray, D.M. (1982). Learning by teaching. Upper Montclair, N.J.: Boynton/Cook.

Perl, S. (1979). The composing processes of unskilled college writers. Research in the Teaching of English, 13, 317-336.

Perl, S. (1980, December). Understanding composing. College Composition and Communication, 31, 363-369.

Perl, S. and Wilson, N. (1986). Through teachers' eyes: Portraits of writing teachers at work. Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.

Reed, S.K. (1982). Cognition: Theory and applications. Monterey, CA.: Brooks/Cole.

Rumelhart, D.E. (1980). Schemata: The building blocks of cognition. In R.J. Spiro, B.C. Bruce, and W.F. Brewer (Eds.), Theoretical issues in reading comprehension (Ch. 2). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Scardamalia, M. and Bereiter, C. (1986). Research on written composition. In M. Wittlock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan Publishing.

Schor, S. (1983). Revising: The writer's need to invent and express relationships. In J.N. Hays, P.A. Roth, J.R. Ramsey, R.D. Foulke (Eds.), The writer's mind: Writing as a mode of thinking. Urbana, Il.: National Council of Teachers of English.

Smith, F. (1973). Reading like a writer. Language Arts, 60, 558-567.

Smith, F. (1981, October). Myths of writing. Language Arts, 58, 792-798.

Sommers, N.I. (1978). Revision in the composing process: A case study of college freshmen and experienced adult writers. Boston: University of Boston.

Sommers, N.I. (1980, December). Revision strategies of student writers and experienced adult writers. College Composition and Communication, 21, 378-388.

Sowers, S. (1979, October). Young writers' preference for non-narrative modes of composition. Language Arts, 56, 829-835.

Stallard, C.K. (1974, Fall). An analysis of the writing behavior of good student writers. Research in the Teaching of English, 8, 206-218.

APPENDIX A-1

Pre-observation Principal Interview Guide

1. Could you tell me something about your background?
   a. Where did you go to school and what did you major in?
   b. Was writing ever an interest at that time?
   c. Have you ever taken a writing course?
2. Did you teach before you went into administration?
   a. How long did you teach?
   b. What grades or subjects did you teach?
   c. Did you emphasize writing in any way while you were teaching?
3. Do you feel you write well yourself?
   a. Where did you learn to write?
   b. Was writing emphasized in school or something you picked up?
4. What do you feel is important about a writing program? Do you feel it has purpose and/or value? Why?
   a. Do you feel there is enough emphasis on writing?
   b. Do you feel the curriculum reflects writing the way it should?
   c. Do you feel the curriculum is being followed?
   d. How do you see the writing program being implemented?
5. As principal, how do you view the writing program of own school? The district writing program?
6. What changes would you like to see implemented in the writing area?

APPENDIX A-1 (continued)

Pre-observation Teacher Interview Guide

1. Could you tell me something about your background?
   a. Where did you go to school and what did you major in?
   b. Was writing ever an interest at that time?
   c. Have you ever taken a writing course?
2. How long have you been teaching?
   a. What grades have you taught?
   b. If you have ever taught in other grades, how did you emphasize writing?
3. Have you ever enrolled in an in-service course or a graduate course on writing?
   a. Did you find it helpful?
   b. Would you say it produced any change in your attitude?
   c. Did you notice any change in your approach to writing or in the time you allotted for writing?
   d. Have you read anything in professional publications that has been helpful to you? In what ways was it helpful?
   e. What is your favorite way to teach writing?
4. Do you enjoy writing yourself? Have you ever contemplated writing for publication? If so, why? If not, why not?
5. How do you view the district writing program here in this school?
6. To what extent do you follow the curriculum guide in writing instruction? What do you find valuable about it? What do you feel should be supplemented?

7. What uses do you feel writing has in the classroom? How are these uses related to purposes outside the classroom?
8. What approach do you like to use in teaching writing, and how do you teach it?
9. In what ways do you emphasize the writing process in instruction?
10. What do you do to teach:
    a. attitudes
    b. motivation
    c. interest
11. What would you like to do that would further emphasize writing? What are the constraints?
12. How do you view the revision stage of the process?
13. How do you teach it?
14. What do you feel is the greatest obstacle to better writing in the classroom?

APPENDIX A-1 (continued)

Student Interview Guide

1. How old are you, _____(name)_____?
2. When did you start writing? What kinds of things do you remember writing?
3. Do you enjoy writing? Why?
4. What do you enjoy writing most? Why?
5. Which would consider the most valuable for writing--planning, writing, or revision? Can they be separated into different, distinct stages?
6. Does your teacher help you in your planning, writing, or revision stages? In what ways?
7. What do you do when you revise?
8. Do you think this is important to what you're writing?
9. Do you revise as soon as you write a sentence, or do you wait until you have finished the entire piece?
10. Does your teacher write in the classroom also?
11. How does your teacher influence what or how you plan, write, or revise?
12. Do you feel comfortable with all the writing assignments?
13. What do you plan to be when you finish school?
14. Does writing have a place in the profession you have chosen? Do you think you would need to revise work you do as an adult?
15. If you were the teacher, would you do anything different to teach the process of writing? What do you think you could do to make it better?

APPENDIX A-2

Questions for Carol's Interview

1. What theories do you favor in techniques of writing? In what ways might this compare to or differ from your philosophy of teaching writing to students?

2. What preliminary work do you do at the beginning of the year in September to prepare your students for your prewriting, writing, and revision techniques? Anything especially for revision?

3. If you use any textbooks or other publications to prepare this writing program, are they available to you through the school? Or did you buy them yourself? Or did you make them up as you saw the need for them?

4. Do you use a textbook of any kind to guide what you do in teaching prewriting, writing, or revision?

5. Do you use the technique of brainstorming often with this program? In what ways is it helpful?

6. What would you think of the students writing in journals as part of their writing experience?

7. Do you keep a personal journal?

8. Do you enjoy writing? Do you do any writing yourself? If so, what kinds?

9. Do you make lessons plans for the writing classes? If so, what kind of plans do you make? Are these plans different from other parts of language arts? If not, do you make plans for other parts of your language arts program?

10. Do you have a timetable or schedule of what you want to cover with your writing program? If so, how do you arrive at the schedule you create?

11. How do you create the "writing atmosphere" in your classroom?

12. As I recall, you decided to teach the process approach in writing because of an in-service program.
    a. When did you decide to link it with literature?
    b. The stories you chose that I observed were "The Sniper" by O'Flaherty for a two-week unit and "The Bet" by Chekov for a four- to five-week unit. You also had a five-week playwriting unit. What other stories do you use? How many units do you cover in a year?

c. Did you choose them for specific purposes? What are you looking for in each one?
d. Do you only want to teach one aspect at a time or do you introduce more than one with each selection?

13. When searching for a new story, do you take one you know about or read until you find one that fits a predetermined purpose? Do you change stories every year?

14. The worksheet you gave for The Sniper's Change of Attitude was for time sequence and organization of the paragraph you wanted them to write.
    a. Did you design this sheet yourself?
    b. Have you used it before? Has it been developed over a period of time?
    c. You lead or direct their answers. Do you find this method works better than letting them try to answer it themselves?
    d. What was the name of the book in which you found "The Sniper"?
    e. Do you have such an organizational worksheet for each story?

15. The outline worksheet you handed out for "The Sniper" was on the topic sentence. In your organization of this sheet you direct the writer to think about three main ideas. What results were you hoping for?

16. Do you find spending five to six weeks writing plays as productive for writing as your stories because of the time involved?

17. How do you determine how many weeks to spend on each writing unit? Do you determine what you are to emphasize first and then determine the time to be allotted?

18. You really emphasize transitional devices. Your handout gives the students categories from which to choose. What was the source or was there more than one?

19. Do you have mini-lessons on revision techniques other than your brainstorming sessions that are combined with the planning sessions, such as the change of attitude worksheet from "The Sniper." How does this help to teach revision?

20. I noticed you had several different editing sheets--one for "The Sniper" and one for "The Bet." Are they of your own design? Do you teach revision as a technique with these sheets? If not, how do you teach revision?

21. Do you encourage one group of students always to work together for ideas or editing or do you like to have changes in the groups? Why?

22. Could your students edit on their own? Or do you feel more is accomplished with a team effort? Do you feel they use the editing time wisely when they work in teams?

23. How does wandering around the room conferring with students by asking questions and exchanging ideas improve their writing? What is the purpose in doing this?

24. Some of the editing techniques taught and emphasized were: checking the topic sentence, transitions, word choice, reading aloud, and organization of material. What else do you feel is important in revising?

25. Do you feel the students like to revise? Why, or why not?

26. This particular class is a regular language arts class. In the literature section of the work do you discuss mood and style and other writing techniques? Is there any carryover? If so, in what ways?

27. You used xeroxed copies of paragraphs in packets for the students to use to critique finished products. The students were asked to comment on each theme and how it was written. Do you find that over the course of the year the students improve in their comments and criticisms from the examples and your comments? In what ways?

28. Were the evaluation sheets you used for each story your design? Did the students find them helpful in understanding their grade? Is each evaluation different for each story since you are emphasizing different things?

29. Do you ever have writing with the students choosing their own topics to write about? What do you see as the advantages or disadvantages of this system?

30. Do you feel the students improve their writing techniques during their year with you? In what ways? Do you notice a difference in their writing or thinking or in both?

31. Do you feel they improve their revision techniques--or acquire them--with your methods? In what ways?

32. What do you do about non-productive students? What kind of work do you get from them? Do they hand in all their writing assignments? Is it possible for a student to fail writing in your class?

33. Do you see any relationship between good/poor writers and their attitude about revisions? In what ways? How would you teach revision so that students would make it a natural part of the writing process? What do you expect a student to do to his or her

paper when he or she is revising?

34. Do you feel there are any constraints upon you for teaching writing with a process approach? If so, what are they?

35. Is your principal supportive of your efforts in your writing program?

36. Is your method of teaching writing more innovative than those used by other teachers at your school? If so, in what ways?

37. Do other teachers support the process approach of writing? Do they try your method?

38. How do parents support your writing program? Any compliments or complaints?

39. How do you view computers in a writing program? Would you find it easier to have students write and revise if they used them?

40. Do you plan any changes for next year? If so, what kind?

41. Beside in-service programs which are mandated, do you take any courses on your own? If so, in what areas are they?

42. How would you describe the school district in which you teach? Demographically? Socioeconomically? Does the school reflect the community? What type of community do you have?

43. What do you think are the primary concerns of students when they are revising?

44. What kind of academic climate is promoted by the school administration and/or the school board?

45. You are so enthusiastic about your writing program. What would you say is your greatest motivation?

46. Are the parents in this school district concerned with school affairs and what goes on in the classroom? If so, to what extent?

47. What kind of emphasis do you feel should be made on the importance of teaching revision?

48. How many schools do you have in this district? How many students are in the junior high? Is this school just for the seventh and eighth grade?

APPENDIX A-2 (continued)

Questions for Linda's Interview

1. What theories do you favor in the teaching of writing? In what ways might this compare to or differ from your philosophy of teaching writing to students?

2. As an accomplished writer yourself, what kind of an environment do you like to work in?

3. Do you think this might influence the kind of environment you want for students who are writing in your classes?

4. What do you do to create a "writing atmosphere" for students?

5. You started the year with roll-calls to see where each student was. Did you discontinue the practice? If so, why?

6. How did the conference tables work out as an aid to editing and writing? I noticed you used them at first, but use became less frequent as time went on.

7. You stated when I first talked to you that you were planning to try to adapt some of Atwell's techniques for eighth grade to Graves's techniques, which you felt were more for primary children. It was to be an experiment this year. What techniques of Atwell's did you feel would work with your class? Do you feel the experiment has been successful? Which techniques were and which were not?

8. What do you feel you have learned from the experiment?

9. You mentioned you were going to have to come to some kind of compromise between the techniques of the process and what you could be happy with in a writing program.
    a. What kind of compromises did you decide upon?
    b. What would be an ideal situation for you for your writing program?

10. How many mini-lessons did you feel were needed this year? How do you decide when one is needed?

11. Do you ever use a textbook in your writing program? If so, for what purposes? Which one?

12. Do you keep a personal journal?

13. Do you have students writing in a personal journal? If so, what kind of articles? If not, would you consider doing this is in the future?

14. You mentioned that you "went with the flow" instead of writing lesson plans for your writing classes, which are part of your language arts classes. Do you write lesson plans for spelling, grammar, or reading? If so, why not for the writing portion?

15. By going "with the flow," you are completely putting the writing program in the hands of the students, which is recommended by Graves and Atwell. How does this work for you? What are some of the strengths and weaknesses? Do you try to influence their choice of topics?

16. How strong would you say is your emphasis on prewriting, writing, and revision? Do you feel any one of them is more important than the others? How do you introduce the revision techniques you want the class to use?

17. You helped students with word choice, grammatical problems, focus, and organization when you conferred with them on their writing as you moved around the room. What is your purpose in doing this and where did you get the idea to do so?

18. Do you like the students to use computers in writing? Do you feel it gives them greater scope? Why?

19. I noticed long stories--chapter after chapter--being written by students on the computers. Do they also do this when they are not using the computers? Was it sparked by two students working together as a team? Was their motivation the Young Writers Contest?

20. Did you notice a difference in the output of writing after the computer time was over? If so, why do you think this is so?

21. Later a number of students in your class expressed a dislike for revision. They said they hated to revise. What do you see as the problem?

22. How do you feel about the school policy of changing students every quarter? What effect does this have on your writing program? Is this a constraint or a benefit?

23. How do you deal with students who are transferred each quarter into your writing program? Do you have any handouts or mini-lessons to teach them the procedures you use for prewriting, writing, or revision? Do they have any difficulty catching up to the other students?

24. What do you do about non-productive students in writing?

25. Do you see any relationship between good/poor students and their feelings about revision? Do students enjoy revising? How would you teach revision so that students would make it a natural part of the writing process? What do you expect a student to do to his paper when he is revising?

26. Why did you feel you had to return to a "traditional" mode when you taught the descriptive paragraph as part of the regular curriculum? What do you mean by "traditional" in this sense? Is there a connection between "traditional" and the curriculum in your mind?

27. Where did you get the handouts you gave for the descriptive paragraph unit? Were any of your design?

28. You gave out several handouts, or idea sheets, but you said you hated to do so. Why did you feel this way?

29. When you were working with one of the descriptive paragraph sheets you set rules to use in writing such as not using <u>you</u> or <u>your</u> in the paragraph. Were some of these rules covered in mini-lessons before? Were these reminders from what you had observed from their writings?

30. You mentioned that little work was coming in during the third quarter from the students. You felt those who worked on computers found revision easier to do. When they had to use long hand once again, they found it difficult to write and then rewrite. You mentioned that this was only part of the contributing factors involved. What other factors do you feel were involved?

31. You required four writings due the second quarter with two poems allowed of the four. Is there any particular length that is required for any of these writings?

32. You mentioned that four writings would determine a C grade, even if they were A in quality. How many are needed for a B or an A? Does quality count? What is your criteria?

33. When did you decide you had to put a number on how many pieces were to be handed in each quarter? And why?

34. The third quarter you had five pieces due, a persuasive piece, a descriptive paragraph, and three others which could include one poem. Was this the minimum for a C grade?

35. How do you decide on the number of writings for each quarter? How do you see this as appropriate for gifted students, for example?

36. How do you grade the themes or articles handed in? How do the students know the crtieria you have used?

37. Do you feel the principal is supportive of your efforts in your writing program?

38. How do other English teachers view your writing program? Do they use the process approach to writing?

39. Do you plan any changes for next year? If so, what kind?

40. What kind of emphasis do you feel should be made on the importance of teaching revision?

41. How do parents support your writing program? Any complaints or compliments?

42. What do you think are the primary concerns of students when they are revising?

43. How would you describe the school district in which you teach? Does the school reflect the community? What type of community do you have?

44. What kind of academic climate is promoted by the school administration and the school board?

45. Are the parents in this school district concerned with school affairs and what goes on in the classroom? If so, to what extent?

46. How many schools do you have in this district? How many students do you have here at the junior high? Is this school just for seventh and eighth grade?

APPENDIX A-2 (continued)

Questions for Sarah's Interview

1. You have tried Atwell's techniques of writing this year as an experiment.
    a. How was this different from what you use to do to teach writing?
    b. Did it change your theories or philosophy about writing?
    c. What comparisons can you make about how you taught revision?

2. Why did you choose Atwell's techniques to use for your Masters project? Would you have done this if it weren't for the MA project?

3. You said it took you a while to get up enough courage to introduce the writing workshop. What were your thoughts at that time? Why were you afraid to start the workshop?

4. How did you prepare your classes for the innovation?

5. How did you introduce it?

6. Do you prepare weekly lesson plans? What kind of planning do you make for the writing workshop?

7. Did you choose the textbook you use? Or is it standard eighth grade equipment? Did you have to use it or was it just easier to do so?

8. How did you create the "writing atmosphere" in your classroom that you mention in your paper ..."structured, yet encouraging, and supportive workshop atmosphere" (Graves, 1982)?

9. Do you feel you have succeeded in setting up this kind of atmosphere? If so, to what extent?

10. Where did you get your ideas for the subjects used for mini-lessons?

11. Some of your mini-lessons are from Atwell.
    a. How much time did it take you to present them in the beginning and feel they were going to work?
    b. How much emphasis did you place on the process in the beginning?

12. For the mini-lessons you wrote, how much time would you say it took to do them? Did you write them as you saw a need?

13. You had other handouts (3) from Scholastic Magazine. How did you get them? Were they helpful/useful?

14. How did you introduce revision? Where did you get the ideas on how to teach it? What do you feel is the weakest part of teaching the revision process? Do you feel the revision techniques are now a part of the writing process of all the students?

15. You mentioned early tension among students over group share. What kind of tension and how long did this last? Do you feel the group share is a good way for revision to emerge?

16. Do you consider group share a helpful revision technique?

17. You keep a personal journal. How often do you write in it? What kind of things do you write?

18. You wrote in your journal that the writing workshop was going to work for you. What had been going on that made you realize that?

19. The students also keep journals. What was the purpose of the student journal? Did it fulfill its original purpose? Do students use revision techniques in their journals? Could the journal be used in any other way?

20. You gave assigned topics for the journal writing. Where did you get the titles? Do you object to giving other titles for pieces to students if they ask or are stuck for ideas?

21. Some students welcomed the freedom of topic choice. What do you do if they run out of ideas?

22. Some students want to be given topics to write about. What do you do about them?

23. You used one period for a group share for "suggestions for a better workshop experience" during which the students offered suggestions to improve the workshop. Was this your idea? Was it helpful? In what ways?

24. How do you view computers in a writing program? Do you use computers in your program at all? Would you find it easier for students to write and revise if they used them?

25. How do non-productive students fit into your program? What do you do about them? Was this part of your decision to require a certain number of pieces each quarter? What do you think is a balanced number of writings to require for each quarter?

26. Do you see any relationship between good/poor writers and their attitude about revising? Do students enjoy revising? How would you teach revision so that students would make it a natural part of the writing process? What do you expect a student to do to his paper when he is revising?

27. Have you seen an improvement in general writing skills for your students this year? If so, what kinds?

28. What do you feel you have learned from this experiment?

29. Do you intend to continue the writing workshop? If so, how would you change it? What worked and what didn't?

30. Have you had the support of the principal and/or administration? Is this a benefit or a constraint?

31. How have other English teachers viewed your program? Do they support it? Will they try it?

32. How have parents reacted to this program? Any complaints or compliments?

33. What kind of emphasis do you feel should be made on the importance of teaching revision?

34. What do you think are the primary concerns of students when they are revising?

35. How would you describe the school district in which you teach? Does the school reflect the community? What type of community do you have?

36. What kind of academic climate is promoted by the school administration and the school board?

37. Are the parents in this school district concerned with school affairs and what goes on in the classroom? If so, to what extent?

38. How many schools do you have in this district? How many students do you have here at the junior high? Is this school just for seventh and eighth grade?

APPENDIX B-1
Outline for Brainstorming Story

Name _____

How does the Sniper's attitude towards war change in this short story?

Beginning | point of change | end

-142-

possible transitions

possible transitions

... sentence.

APPENDIX B-2
Outline for Paragraph Organization

Name _____

Outline

I Topic Sentence

A. MAIN idea for the beginning of the story

B. MAIN idea for the point of change

C. MAIN idea for the end of the story

II Clincher sentence

APPENDIX B-3
Student Editing Sheets

Name (editor) _____

1. Write the name of the student who wrote the paragraph _____

2. The editor should read every sentence aloud to her/her partner

3. Does every sentence make sense? yes no

4. Is every sentence a complete sentence —no fragments yes no

5. Is the punctuation correct? yes no

6. Is the spelling correct? yes no
no "a lot" or "got"

7. Is the topic sentence clear? yes no

8. Do all sentences of proof relate to the topic sentence? yes no

9. Does each sentence logically follow the previous sentence? yes no

10. Is there a strong clincher sentence yes no

11. Is there one quote? yes no
Are there two transitions? yes no
Is the verb tense consistent? yes no

Writer_____

Editor_____

_____ 1. Read the entire paragragh aloud.

_____ 2. Check for fragments and run-ons.

_____ 3. Correct spelling.

_____4. Check punctuation-periods and commas.

_____5. Read the topic sentence. Does it make sense? It should not be just a statement of fact; it should state an opinion about the Banker's change.

_____6. Read statements of proof. Is each sentence clear? Does each sentence relate to the topic sentence? Do the sentences logically follow one another?

_____7. Does the paragragh discuss the Banker's views at the end of the story?

_____8. Is there a strong clincher sentence?

_____9. Is the quote used effectively?

_____10. Is the verb tense consistent?

_____11. Are there two transitions?

_____12. Does every sentence begin with a different word?

_____13. Did the writer use passive voice? Change to active voice.

_____14. Did the writer use only the third person?

_____15. Check for any grammar problems. (a lot-got)

APPENDIX B-4
Student Evaluation Sheets

Name_____

1.	Introductory Paragraph clear strong states an opinion includes author and title	25
2.	Paragraphs of proof relate to topic logically follow one another clear	20
3.	Clincher paragraph strong clear final idea	25
4.	Grammar spelling tense voice word choice third person punctuation fragments and run-ons	15
5.	Sentence structure transitions variation use of quotations	15

Name_____

1.	Topic sentence clear strong states an opinion	15
2.	Sentences of proof relate to topic logically follow one another clear	25
3.	Clincher sentence strong clear final idea	15
4.	Grammar spelling tense voice word choice third person punctuation fragments and run-ons	20
5.	Sentence structure transitions variation	15
6.	Quotation appropriate explained	10

"The Bet"

In Anton Chekov's short story, "The Bet", two main characters, the banker and the lawyer, lived their lives differently, but were somewhat similar at one point in their lives. The lawyer had started out with a greed for money, but as the story came to a close, he rejected material possessions and all that the physical life held. Interestingly, it was the banker who didn't value money at the beginning of the story, while the lawyer didn't value it at the end.

As the story progressed, the lawyer changed drastically from one who was greedy for money, to one who thought that life on earth was meaningless. His greediness showed when he made the bet with the banker to isolate himself for fifteen

years in return for two million dollars. The lawyer was interested in books with light character during the first few years of his isolation. As time went on, he studied every subject from religion to history to language. He learned to value life and the world. His point of change took place as he started to reject the world. As he declared in his letter to the banker, he "despised freedom, life, health, and all that the books call the blessings of the world." The description of his appearance revealed that he was giving up on life. As one can see, the lawyer changed drastically over the period of his isolation.

By the end of the story, the banker agreed with the lawyer's views on life.

In the beginning, he had so much money that it had no value to him; whereas the lawyer would do anything for the possession of money. In time, the banker loses most of his money that he starts to think about it's value. "Fifteen years before he had so many millions to count, but now he was afraid to ask himself what he had more of, money or debts." Money had been so important to him now that he was willing to commit the "ultimate sin" so he didn't have to pay the lawyer. His feelings changed after he read the letter and agreed with the lawyer's views on life. Feeling guilty after reading it, he couldn't bring himself to kill the lawyer. He rejected the idea of the bet, and put the letter

in his age. In the end, the banker's views on life were similar as the lawyer's had been in the beginning.

Although the lawyer and the banker had similar views, they felt differently about the possession of money. The lawyer felt a greediness for money as the beginning, because he had never held any in his possession, whereas the banker was greedy towards money because he used to have so much, but that it's almost gone, he wants it. As the story ended, the lawyer felt that money didn't have any value, because wanting it so badly took away the most important thing to him, his life. Having so much meant that money had no value to the lawyer in the beginning of "The Bet".

DIFFERENT KINDS OF PARAGRAPHS

The Descriptive Paragraph (I)

When you write a descriptive paragraph, you are trying to communicate a picture or feeling in words. You may wish to tell your reader how something looks or how it sounds, smells, feels, or tastes.

Use of specific details helps to create a vivid picture or impression in your reader's mind.

> The old man was thin and gaunt with deep wrinkles in the back of his neck. The brown blotches the benevolent skin cancer brings from its reflection on the tropic sea were on his cheeks. The blotches ran well down the sides of his face, and his hands had the deep-creased scars from handling heavy fish on the cords. But none of these scars were fresh. They were as old as erosions in a fishless desert.—from *The Old Man and The Sea*, by ERNEST HEMINGWAY

The word picture above is much more vivid than if the author had simply said that the man was old and wrinkled, with blotchy skin.

Most descriptive paragraphs deal with sight, but they may appeal to other senses as well—sound, smell, taste, or touch.

Choosing Words and Details Carefully. For each of the items below, list at least three specific descriptive details that could be used in a descriptive paragraph. Appeal to as many senses as you can.

1. a busy restaurant _____

_____

_____

2. a roaring fire _____

_____

_____

3. a newborn baby _____

_____

_____

4. a garden in mid-July _____

_____

_____

5. a deserted beach _____

_____

_____

Copyright © 1984, 1982, 1978 by McDougal, Littell and Company

The Descriptive Paragraph (II)

The order usually used in the descriptive paragraph is *spatial order*. The writer usually describes something by showing how it is situated in relation to something else in the same area or space.

> There was no underbrush in the island of pine trees. The trunks of the trees went straight up or slanted toward each other. The trunks were straight and brown without branches. The branches were high above. Some interlocked to make a solid shadow on the brown forest floor. Beyond the grove of trees was a bare space. It was brown and soft underfoot as Nick walked on it. This was the over-lapping of the pine needle floor, extending out beyond the width of the high branches. The trees had grown tall and the branches moved high, leaving in the sun this bare space they had once covered with shadow. Sharp at the edge of this extension of the forest floor commenced the sweet fern. .—from "Big Two-Hearted River" by ERNEST HEMINGWAY

In this description, the writer has shown the relationship of one thing to another through the use of specific *relation words*, or *direction words*, such as *up, toward each other, beyond*, and *at the edge*. These direction words help the reader to see where the things the writer is describing are situated in relation to each other.

In writing the descriptive paragraph, you must choose specific details carefully. You must also place these details in spatial order through the use of direction words, so that the reader understands the word-picture you are creating.

Writing a Descriptive Paragraph. Write a descriptive paragraph about one of the topics below. Use carefully chosen details, arranged in logical order. Start with a good topic sentence. Use another sheet of paper for your rough draft. Revise, referring to the Guidelines for the Process of Writing.

1. your bedroom
2. the mad scientist's laboratory
3. a campsite
4. the inside of your locker
5. an outdoor market
6. the beach in summer

Copyright © 1964, 1982, 1978 by McDougal, Littell and Company

The Clothes I Wear 1

Describe the clothes you wear and try to interpret what they say about you. Think of the clothes you have and the occasions on which you wear them. Have you ever startled anyone with a particular outfit? If so, do you know why you did it?

The Clothes I'd Like to Wear — But Don't Dare! 2

Describe the clothes and the occasion on which you would wear them if you could unleash your inhibitions (or others' inhibitions), and why you would like to do this.

A Windshield Wiper Speaks Out 3

Imagine you are the windshield wiper in your car going back and forth, back and forth, wiping the rain off your windows. When the sun's out, you've nothing to do. Write a monologue about your life, giving full expression to your "windshield-wiperness."

A Wastepaper Basket Reminisces 4

There you sit on the floor, mouth always open, everyone shoving and throwing things into you. Let's hear you wail about your fate in a monologue!

Copyright 1983 J. Weston Walch, Publisher Portland, Maine 04104-0658

JUST FOR OPENERS

SENTENCES IN SEARCH OF STORIES

- Fourth down and inches to go.

- Anne sat alone for nearly five hours, staring at the silent phone.

- Starting all over again was the hardest thing he'd ever had to do in his life.

- "For tomorrow's assignment, we're going to try something a little different," Miss Matthews said.

- Across the street, a broken neon sign flashed on and off, advertising "Cha-lie's Ba- and Grill."

- "Nobody understands me. Nobody! Why can't you all just go away and leave me alone."

- Chuck hated to admit it, but what he really felt at the funeral, more than anything else, was boredom.

- A ray of sunlight glowed through the Gothic window pane and lit up a small corner of the blue and magenta Persian rug.

- Betsy no longer had a choice—tonight she would have to tell the truth, no matter what happened, no matter how much it hurt.

- Sue knew what her parents would say if Dennis took her to the movies Friday night, but she made up her mind —she was going to say yes.

- "You listen to me—you're not going anywhere. You think you can just use this house like a hotel and come and go as you please. Well, tonight you're staying home with your family, and that's that. I don't want to hear another word about it."

Read through the opening lines above. Then choose the opening that interests you the most, and invent a story, using these lines for your beginning.

Copyright © 1974 by Scholastic Magazines, Inc. / 50 W. 44 Street / New York, N.Y. 10036 / All rights reserved / Printed in U.S.A.

APPENDIX D-1
Reference Sheets for Students

KINDS of Writing for Writing Workshop

1. Personal Experience Narratives (Paragraphs or Longer)
   - pages 379-391 and 442-463 in Heath Grammar and Composition

2. Fictional Narratives (Short Stories and Novellas - tall tales, sci-fi, historical, romance, fairy tales, etc.)
   - check pages mentioned in #1

3. Autobiographies (see me for suggestions)

4. Biographies

5. Essays (Purpose is to describe, explain or give directions & persuade)
   - pages 422-441 in Heath Grammar and Composition

6. Research Reports (required - will do together)
   - pages 465-468 in Heath

7. Reviews of books, Records, plays, movies, and/or TV shows.

8. News Stories (Remember the 5 W's)

9. Reports of Current Events and Features

10. Children's books

11. Advertisements

12. Poetry
    - ballads
    - limericks
    - Rhymed couplets
    - free verse
    - counted syllable for
    - ETC.
    - one sample pg. 331 He
    - see me for many mo

13. Song Lyrics

14. Interviews.

15. Coloring books with text

16. Textbook

17. CARTOONS

18. Editorials (articles stating opin held by the writer)

19. Scripts (Skits, plays, Radio p puppetshows, TV comme cial

20. Letters
    - (to: authors, pen pals, teachers, + editor/of: application, inq thanks, love, complaint protest, advice, apology

HAVING A WRITING CONFERENCE WITH YOURSELF

Read your piece to yourself, at least once but probably several times. The best writers spend a lot of time reading over and thinking about what they've written.

Your next job is to make some decisions about what's down there on that paper: the weaknesses of the piece — the parts that need more work — and its strengths — those parts that work so well you want to do more with them. In other words, your next job is to have a writing conference with yourself.

A writer's biggest question is always, "What is it I'm trying to say here?" The questions below may help you find and shape what you're trying to say.

Questions About Information

Do I have enough information?

What's the strongest or most exciting part of the piece and how can I build on it?
Have I shown (not told) by using examples?
Have I told my thoughts and feelings at the points where my readers will wonder?
Have I told where, when, and with whom this is happening?
Have I described the scene and people with enough detail that a reader can see it happening?
Is there any part that might confuse a reader? Have I explained each part well enough that a reader will know what I mean?
Does this piece need conversation? Did people talk? Have I directly quoted the words they said?

Do I have too much information?

What parts aren't needed — don't add to my point or story? Can I delete them?
What is this piece really about? Are there parts that are about something else? Can I cut them?
Do I have more than one story here? Which is the one story I really want to tell?
Is this a "bed-to-bed" piece, going through every event of the day? Can I focus on just the important part of the day and delete the rest?
Is there too much conversation? Too many fussy little details? Have I explained too much?

Questions About Leads

Does my lead bring my reader right into my piece, into the main ideas or action?
Where does the piece really begin? Can I cut the first paragraph? The first two? The first page?

Questions About Conclusions

Does my conclusion drop off and leave my reader wondering?
Does my conclusion go on and on?
How do I want my reader to feel at the end of the piece? Does this conclusion do it?
What do I want my reader to know at the end of the piece? Does this conclusion do it?

Questions About Titles

Does my title fit what the piece is about?
Is my title a "grabber"? Would it make a reader want to read my piece?

Questions About Style

Have I cluttered my piece with unnecessary adjectives and adverbs?
Have I said something more than once?
Have I used any word(s) too often?
Are any sentences too long and tangled? Too brief and choppy?
Have I paragraphed often enough to give my reader's eyes some breaks?
Have I broken the flow of my piece by paragraphing too often?
Is my infonnation in order? Is this the sequence in which things happened?
Have I grouped together ideas related to each other?
Does the voice stay the same — first person participant (I did it) *or* third person observer (he or she did it)?
Does the verb tense stay the same — present (it's happening now) *or* past (it happened before)?

Editing Conferences

Charles Cooper recently wrote, "It's easier to persist with commas if you know you're engaged in some fundamentally important human activity that has very great consequences for your full development as a human being" (1984). It is my favorite quote about editorial issues, funny and absolutely the truth.

When students understand the importance of what they're trying to say as writers, they also care about how their words go down on the page. They know that in the end what they've said and how it looks each contribute to a reader's appreciation of text. I think we do our kids a disservice to contend that a reader's appreciation is an either/or proposition; that readers either respond to content (in school we usually call it "creativity") or to format (in school, called "basic skills"). Readers respond to both. If we teach simplistic formulas for good writing we leave students wide open to readers' disdain or, worse, their disinterest. Who, other than a teacher, will read an illegible or unpunctuated text? What reader will read, very far anyway, a mechanically perfect text that says nothing?

Revision

1. Underline first word in every line.
   Vary these sentence beginnings

2. Count number of words in each sentence of paragraph two.
   Choose two other paragraphs and count. Have you varied sentence lengths?

3. Circle words you are not sure of spelling.
   Circle spelling with another person, dictionary, teacher.

4. Use inverted sentence order.

5. Begin some sentences with gerunds, infinitive. (Use 24 ways to vary sentence sheet.)

6. Use transitional words and phrases to move from sentence to sentence, paragraph to paragraph.

7. Number each paragraph in correct order.

8. Spider legs, asterisks, cut and paste encouraged

Supplies - Colored pen - Tuesday
Notebook paper - Monday
Bibliography cards - Monday
Note cards
Outline

Bibliography
Alphabetize cards by author
Fill in form letter by letter, punctuation by punctuation

APPENDIX D-2
Narrative Evaluation Sheet

Writer _____

Reader _____

Date _____

EVALUATING NARRATIVES

Narrative Structure

1. Is the setting used to create a mood appropriate to the story? 1. _____
2. Are characters revealed through action, dialogue, and description? 2. _____
3. Do events occur in chronological order? 3. _____
4. Is the point of view suitable? 4. _____
5. Does the setting match the characters' thoughts and feelings? 5. _____
6. Are sensory details used? 6. _____
7. Does the dialogue sound natural? 7. _____
8. Does the plot have an event that triggers action, a conflict, and an outcome? 8. _____
9. Does the story have an appropriate title? 9. _____

Sentences and Words

10. Are the sentences varied? 10. _____
11. Are rambling sentences and repetition avoided, except to create special effects? 11. _____
12. Are specific words used? 12. _____
13. _____ 13. _____
14. _____ 14. _____
15. _____ 15. _____

Comments: _____

D.C. Heath and Company. All rights reserved.

Follow Numbers

pp 53-55 **First Day** - Foundation of the Workshop

(1) This year we're going to have a writers' workshop two-three days a week
- Tue., Wed., Thurs.,
- On each of these three days you'll be working in some way on your writing

(4) Certain rules.
1. There is No erasing - how writers think and change their minds is important
simply draw a line through it

2. Write on one side of paper only - cut and paste reorganize the piece

3. Save everything - creating a history of yourself as writer
Save all false starts, notes, doodles lists, drafts, etc.

4. Date and Label everything - Examples = NOTES, DRAFT # 1

5. Speak in quiet voices
WRITING is THINKING!
If conferring with student speak quietly

6 Work really hard

* 7. Skip every other line when writing

p. 84,85 First Day - (Continued)

For ten minutes - write

Seven minutes before bell rings - Finish the sentence your writing and assemble with their writing on stage

(2) Pass out daily writing Folders
Must have every day - Do not lose it.
This is where you save everything - all drafts, in
Three forms to be stapled to Folder
a. sheet to list Finished piece and dates
b. sheet to list all skills learned this year
c. sheet to list ideas for writing.

(3) 1. MINI - LESSON
2. STATUS - of - the Class Conference
3. WRITE / Confer (Circulate)
4. Group Share

TIME
OWNERSHIP
RESPONSE

APPENDIX D-4

Writing Survey

1. If I walked into the classroom and said, "Today we are going to write." what is your immediate reaction and briefly explain why you think you had that reaction.

2. Now describe more thoroughly how you feel about writing. Is it something you find easy or difficult? Are some types of writing easier for you than others? What types are they and why? When are most comfortable with writing? When are you most uncomfortable with writing?

3. Why do people learn to write?

4. How do people learn to write?

5. What do you think a writer needs to do in order to write well? Think about this carefully.

6. If you could change one think about writing in school what would it be?

7. Please list three specific, positive aspects of writing workshop.

8. Please list three specific, negative aspects of writing workshop.

9. Please list three possible changes you think necessary for a more successful writing workshop.

APPENDIX E-1

Observer's Log Entries

4

Carol 11/13/87 Friday

Side 2
Tape 3-B
(410-652 end

Time:	Students	Teacher
10:56 - 11:04	Spelling test	
11:04 ↓	Outline sheets - editing must be corrected	T. brings up problems she has noticed in writing paragraphs sentences in R must go back to story to prove it generalizations must be backed with concrete examples from story.
* Revision 11:10 ↓	Go to editing team around room use editing sheets to make corrections	← directions from teacher
		T. goes to students
	2 girls show T. what have done by reading R aloud use editing sheet to correct refer to it often	Discusses ideas about R + meaning so they can revise directed - instruction (?)
	2 boys	T. asks them questions about what they meant in R
	2 girls (Jill + Stacey)	T. reads part of R - then asks questions about meaning, punctuation
	Jill comes up with several things that are pertinent "It's so choppy"	
	While Jill is looking up word another boy pokes up - quick answer given	(T. gave quick answer here to boy) Continues to suggest + probe for other words Suggests rewriting + seeing her when finished
		Tape 3-C continuation (0-170)
		T. consults boy about thesaurus - words

Page 5 | Linda | 12/3/87 | Tape 2-B Side 1 (0-443)

Time	Students	Teacher
10:15	On computers Two boys writing a many chapter story for young authors contest	T. divided between computer rm. + library area computers
	S. asks observer to help with questions for an interview she wishes to have	In room asks students to write a description of someone they care about notes on everything girl can think about but para
	Can interview someone + write something about them story poem	Poetry is current project
		T. at desk - s. come to her
	S. has topic lists to refer to when need a topic to write about when list exhausted need to make a new one	Goes to conference table to confer with 2 boys who are not working suggests a how-to paper
		Goes to student who has started writing - New years Eve - Person to write about
	3 students continually fooling around	T. suggests girl who has no more topics to write the heading her trip + Washington + list all the things associated with trip - for new ideas for writing
	Noise level gradually rises	T. questions girl about camp experience to get her to write about a person there S. very reluctant
		T. questions girl about a girl she is writing about. S. stuck on topic
		T reads poem on Friends
		Goes to library to close down computer

Poems

H ....
A ....
L ....
L ....
O ....
W ....
E ....
E ....
N ....

9

Sarah 12/1/87

Tape 1-C (0—
Side 2

Time	Students	Teacher
11:05	Assignment for 12/2 text - p. 300 Ex. 5 (Wed) p. 316 Ex A (Thurs) Journal: School would be great if.... (composition) to write Spelling This ed's Journal's assignment Why? (Any response)	Asked S. to get writing folders out Has an overhead machine ready Classroom routine Collecting rewrites + Journals Turns off lights T. praises for the variety of types of writing this class does Mini-lesson (for a couple of days) on opening ¶'s Beginning ¶'s the focus (leads) Can use 4 stories have done if chose Showed ¶'s on overhead
Mini-lesson on opening ¶'s and how to write them (planning)	S. brainstormed what they saw in ¶. (i.e.:) building interest slow start	Interaction between T + S about what is good and bad, what liked or not liked
	Students pick out one story to revise opening ¶ in all 3 ways 1. action lead 2. dialogue lead 3. reaction lead	Dialogue important to story Introduction ¶ - setting the tone what S usually do (1) Action lead - author puts you right into the action - opening ¶
		(Description tends to draw you in more) to the story description will let you draw conclusions about how beautiful, or how run down
	Does not have to do whole story - just opener when it changes story doesn't matter	(2) Dialogue lead - ¶ starts with 2 people talking to each other
	(This one today will) be action lead for tomorrow maybe	(3) Reaction lead - a character thinking about something
	S. need to sit down + start writing	"Writing means revision" Writing first, revising after
	Ss ask for help by going up with changes already started	"Action means things you do"

executive

12/1/87

Time	Students	Teacher
	May be due tomorrow To be continued in class on 12/2	Actions: discussions with individuals about what actions are Write a new sentence / for the story Write a new ¶ / Describe what you do

This class is really into writing and catches on so well. This is really a major lesson and will probably take all week. I would classify this as a planning lesson, although revision is obviously involved.

10/27/87

After-impressions

The atmosphere was quite relaxed. Students wrote in whatever position they felt comfortable. Some were lying on their stomachs writing; some were in twos at tables; some at their desks; some at other desks they had moved to.

This was not teacher-directed, except to occasionally reprimand (or remind) gently about work. It was not necessarily planned, for as each student who needed help came to sit with T. she looked over paper and questioned them about what they thought their problem was before helping them or suggesting a course of action

Observations later 2/9/88

Sarah seemed tired today. Her momentum and enthusiasm is great low ebb. She said she didn't enjoy the research paper which took too much time away from writing workshop. She has designated Tuesdays as writing workshop while the rest of the week must be devoted to the research paper. This is in order to retain some continuity for the writing.

It occurs to me that all three teachers, who really work at teaching writing produce students who write. They are working. Their plans work, whether they are traditionally oriented or not. This may be the real answer — the efforts, the plans, and constant work produce results — using the process approach.

Student: Absent.

Mrs. Jason Byan.

Student: Absent.

Mrs. Bobbie.

Student: Here. Oh, final.

Mrs. Mike

Student: First draft.

Mrs. Brian. Jason.....

Student: First draft.

Mrs. Ricky.

Student: I'm reviewing my first draft now.

Mrs. Lisa.

Student: First draft.

Mrs. Dina.

Student: I'm not sure if I finished conferencing on Thursday... I don't know. You said some people were still gonna conference with you. They didn't get their conference with Diana, then me, and then whoever.

Mrs. Right. Okay. Now let me ask you, when you're conferencing with me, it's for a problem you are having -- not to listen to your whole paper.

Student: No. You said I had to conference with you.

Student: Remind you don't have to listen, during group share, you said you have to request a conference.

Mrs. Diana, you're conferencing, right?

Student: Yes. Conferencing.

Mrs. Brian.

Tape 1A
Mrs. Osborne
Page 13

22

Student: I'm still writing.

Mrs. Sternstein.

Student:

Mrs. Bonnie.

38

Student: I need a conference.

Mrs. Andy.

36 72

Student: Final copy.

Mrs. And why did you end it?

Student: Because I just couldn't think of anywhere to go with it at the end so I figure I'll go back to it.

Mrs. Oh, this is the one we heard in group share.

Student: Yes.

Mrs. Okay. What was your second one you started.

30

Student: I just felt stupid. I didn't like...

Mrs. No. It wasn't stupid.

Student: ...doing that. You know, I was going I love "Peace of War" -- novels about that sort of thing...

Mrs. Like a historical type? Okay.

Student: But that didn't work out at all.

Mrs. Okay. Why do you think that?

Student: It's just.... I don't know.

Mrs. Too difficult?

Student: Yes. It wasn't difficult. It just...

Mrs. Where you didn't have the plot?

Student: ...wasn't interesting.

Tape 1A
Mrs. Osborne
Page 14

Mrs. Okay. And that's one you...

Student: Now this one's okay. I been working on the ... a dream that I had when we had just moved into our house and we were getting on the windows and there were three people who returned to kill us, and...

Mrs. This is fiction or true?

Student: This is fiction.

Mrs. Okay. That's good news. Let me ask you now. So you're saying to me you don't know which story to go with at this point?

Student: Well, it's not.... I just don't know if I'm right. I just can't get into any of those stories.

Mrs. All right. Let me ask you, though, when you abandoned this, it was just because of the ending. If I remember this, when we heard it in group share, it was pretty good -- I know we had a lot of fun.... I have to refresh my memory here. Okay. Let's see. Do you want, at this point, attempt to finish one so that you feel that you've completed something. Is that where you're at?

Student: Yes.

Mrs. Okay. But you're not sure which one. Do you have a gut feeling which one you want to go with?

Student: If I could think of an ending...

Mrs. Do you want to read this to me again and let's see....

Student: (Reading paper)

Mrs. Okay. Is this a fiction story?

Student: No.

Mrs. Oh, this is true. It happened to you.

Student: Yes, it did.

Mrs. Okay. I see a couple of possibilities here. If you were to add a little bit more description here where you say, right at the beginning... there was a quaver -- and maybe describe a little bit of what happens to desks -- under -- you know, chil-

3431 (22)
41 40
37
38

APPENDIX E-3

PROFILE OF 8TH GRADE L.A. TEACHERS OF WRITING

Data Reduction Chart

	Carol	Student's Response
A	General approach to children Relaxed, gentle, open, sincere, very happy and congenial person; very enthusiastic. Controlled noise level even when editing teams were meeting.	Responsive, cooperative, and open. Willing to work.
B	Philosophy Has read some Applebee, but mostly influenced by speakers who came for Township Writing Curriculum. a. Superintendent wanted emphasis on expository writing. b. She wanted rewriting (revision) as emphasis. Likes approach but uses traditional approaches as well. Use of theories Does not seem to use any.	
C	Thoughts on revision 1. Stress on importance of revising. Considers most important--very high. 2. For good writers--she feels the more effort you put in the better it is. Weak writers--just put something down and that's it. Look at it only as an assignment. For revision to become natural part of writing--maybe Christmas time. (See p. 9)	All recognize its importance. Some like it; others don't necessarily want to do it but see its importance--leads to better grade and better finished product; carries over to Social Studies, but not to personal writing necessarily. Use editing sheets; discussion of ideas. Good writers seem to feel it's fun; like to change things and use it in other subjects and personal items. A few writers seem to hate it--perhaps poor writers: a. Too much trouble. b. They feel not good at it--spelling, mechanics, etc.

APPENDIX E-3 (continued)

PROFILE OF 8TH GRADE L.A. TEACHERS OF WRITING

Data Reduction Chart

	Carol	Student's Response
D	General preparation in writing 1. Lesson plans--plans carefully. Doesn't want to infringe on another's area (literature). Is fairly exact about what she wants to cover.	Students follow handouts with teacher guidance and help. - Mini-lessons part of whole. - Active participation.
	2. Mini-lessons--many brainstorming sessions. a. Starting each sentence. b. Verb tense. c. Use of verbs. d. Checklist for writing (which expands with time).	
	3. With class--each story carefully planned for focus, topic sentences, single paragraphs, multi-paragraph essay, work sheets, editing sheets.	Students start slowly and build up confidence in ability to do work.
E	Creating writing atmosphere Relaxed--most important. Students must feel trust in order to write. Open atmosphere. Brainstorming helps everybody see that all ideas can be good and important.	Students try out ideas on teacher and peers. Help atmosphere of trust and openness. Relaxed and congenial most of the time.

APPENDIX E-3 (continued)

PROFILE OF 8TH GRADE L.A. TEACHERS OF WRITING

Data Reduction Chart

	Carol	Student's Response
F	Teaching revision: revision strategy Teacher-directed traditional class. 1. Introduction to class--brainstorming, putting down ideas any way at first. 2. Following through--wandering around to confer with groups, exchange ideas and organizing them, topic sentences (opinions), backed by proof (sentences) clincher, editing and revising, sentence combining, transitional devices, read aloud, editing sheets. 3. Group share--has team editing with same partners; group reading and sharing with final papers. 4. Weakest point--scheduling: writing, grammar and spelling in one period, literature in another. Great frustration for teacher. Limits what can teach with writing and time for individualized attention. 5. Strongest point--uses literature as a writing source. Chooses stories for various foci--cohesiveness of units she creates.	Editing teams work to help partners revise. - Cooperative effort--relaxed. Points given to editors as incentive--composition 1/3 of grade. Are allowed to edit even after final draft handed in. Weakest point: Strongest point: teacher-student relationship, student editing teams.
G	Comparison of what said to what did Uses process approach connecting writing to literature. Uses stories for focus for paragraphs. With various devices and work sheets, students learn to plan, write and revise, eventually on their own as natural part of writing. These were the stated goals and were accomplished.	

APPENDIX E-3 (continued)

PROFILE OF 8TH GRADE L.A. TEACHERS OF WRITING

Data Reduction Chart

	Linda	Student's Response
A	General approach to children Gentle, casual, flexible, soft-spoken, permissive, relaxed. Described class as "volatile."	Work in spurts. Mostly cooperative. Generally relaxed.
B	Philosophy 1. Use of Graves for Masters project the previous year. 2. Wanted to add Atwell techniques to program this year. 3. Favors allowing students to discover process for themselves. 4. Doesn't believe in grading writing. 5. Wants to individualize program for every student. Use of theories 1. Knowledgeable about theories. 2. She feels she uses them but they must be adapted to individual temperament, classroom, situation. "...There's no recipe, no magic formula...."	
C	Thoughts on revision 1. Feels revision is very important--most important of stages. 2. Doesn't feel Atwell's techniques--group share and conference center tables-- worked well for her. 3. "Revision...is most difficult and most important." 4. Doesn't know any students who like to revise; some are more willing to revise than others. 5. Doesn't know how to teach revision so students would make it a natural part of writing. Sees no relationship between good/poor writers and attitude toward revision.	Write it any way at first; can rewrite. Some proofread and revised as went along. Easier on computers with IBM Speller, etc. Good writer doesn't like to revise but feels has to; no carry over to other subjects or personal writing. Poor students hate revising--made deals with teacher not to do it.

APPENDIX E-3 (continued)

PROFILE OF 8TH GRADE L.A. TEACHERS OF WRITING

Data Reduction Chart

	Linda	Student's Response
D	General preparation in writing 1. Lesson plans--doesn't make any--"goes with the flow." 2. Mini-lessons--about 40% to 50% of time, she said. 3. With class--wandered around class answering random questions as came up. Gave suggestions, asked questions about focus, organization, word choice, etc. Feels need to guide students toward topics more than Atwell recommends. Used traditional teacher-directed methods when teaching curriculum demand-descriptive paragraph. "Able students who finish early have nothing to do. This is a drawback of this kind of program." (See 3/17 tape 2-G)	No handouts for mini-lessons received. Class talkative--fairly quiet at first but noise level very high at times and increased with time. Allowed to do other things if didn't feel like writing: other subjects, talking, applying nail polish, variety of things--going to library, etc. Students run dry--run out of ideas--don't want to write.
E	Creating writing atmosphere 1. Displays work of other children to see what is possible for class. 2. Has them bring writing materials to class. 3. Individual writing folders in class all the time. 4. Providing resources--dictionaries, etc. 5. Clustering for ideas. 6. Classified ads to stimulate ideas. 7. Certain stimulators (not explained). 8. Relaxed. 9. Wandering around to confer with them and offer suggestions.	Do not help the writing atmosphere.

APPENDIX E-3 (continued)

PROFILE OF 8TH GRADE L.A. TEACHERS OF WRITING

Data Reduction Chart

	Linda	Student's Response
F	Teaching revision: revision strategy Teacher not sure how to go about teaching revision. 1. Introduction to class--a few mini-lessons on writing every other line; reading aloud to hear your writing. Showed three versions of a piece --beginning to finished product. Uses grades to promote revision. (p. 9) 2. Following through--wandering around room, asking questions, conferring, helping with the writing, reminding them of grammar work done--combining sentences. 3. Group share--didn't work for her "because of way the room is set up; wasn't not successful, but wasn't done enough to make sure if it was successful." 4. Weakest point--getting students to revise; it's work. Allows students to do other work during writing. Admits doesn't know how to teach it--students being able to recognize where revision is needed. 5. Strongest point--	Students go to her as well as vice versa. Many hate revision or see no need. Revision to them is correcting spelling or simple proofreading. Most responded well to computer for work and fun. Not as responsive afterwards. Some are allowed to skip revision step. Weakest point: mixed signals on importance of revision. Strongest point:
G	Comparison of what said to what did Stated wished to use Atwell's techniques and adapt them to 8th grade. Wanted to experiment with change with Atwell. Used only a few of Atwell's techniques at first but dropped use after a short time. When asked about use of Atwell, denied intention and claimed only used Graves.	Because of mixed signals, students do not feel they have to stay on task. This does not encourage writing. At end of each grading period, teacher has whole week of writing so students can catch up.

APPENDIX E-3 (continued)

PROFILE OF 8TH GRADE L.A. TEACHERS OF WRITING

Data Reduction Chart

	Sarah	Student's Response
A	General approach to children Gentle, casual, intense, flexible, searching for new ideas always, good interaction with students, very enthusiastic. Controlled noise level even with workshop going on.	Receptive, cooperative; most are responsible, relaxed, have trust in teacher; most are confident students.
B	Philosophy Atwell's techniques vs. what had taught before. Feels only assigned writing, not taught. Some Calkins. Use of theories Knowledgeable about theories. Following Atwell's techniques faithfully.	
C	Thoughts on revision Feels never taught it before. 1. Stress on importance of revising heavy. 2. Good writers find revision easier. Poor writers need a lot of guidance. a) Do well in step-by-step directions. b) Struggle on their own.	Students view revision as important and use it for other subjects and research papers but do not necessarily use for personal things. "Writing is rewriting." "If you are willing to rewrite, you can write." "Revision is easier because you are correcting and changing instead of starting from scratch." Some writers are not very productive and then do less well because they do less writing. Revision can be considered work; some pieces abandoned because do not know how to change to improve.

APPENDIX E-3 (continued)

PROFILE OF 8TH GRADE L.A. TEACHERS OF WRITING

Data Reduction Chart

	Sarah	Student's Response
D	General preparation in writing 1. Lesson plans--jotted out plans for each day--plans to develop specific and better lesson plans over summer. 2. Mini-lessons; originally used those based on Atwell's suggestions--then based on need--short lessons--planned carefully and constantly referred to until became automatic. 3. With the class--planned time with open time for conferencing and seeing individual students.	Students "hungry to write" and complain if other things interfere with writing time. Revision taught before real writing began. Wanted short mini-lessons so could have more time to write and limited to one day a week (Monday). Really enjoyed writing--picked up new ideas and lessons quickly. Bounce ideas off each other. Like freedom to write what want in leisurely fashion--no pressures. Students don't help each other enough in editing--conferring sometimes turn to talking. Like conference table where it must be quiet.
E	Creating writing atmosphere "Structural, yet encouraging and supportive." Gaining trust of students. Teaching students to share their writing with others. Allowing time and freedom for students to create. Walking around to reinforce, confer, offer advice. Showing continuing interest. Being aware of it all the time.	Attitudes cheerful and responsive. Students enjoy writing workshop.

APPENDIX E-3 (continued)

PROFILE OF 8TH GRADE L.A. TEACHERS OF WRITING

Data Reduction Chart

	Sarah	Student's Response
F	Teaching revision: revision strategy 1. Introduction to class according to Atwell: a. How to add words, sentences, paragraphs. b. Cutting and pasting. c. Use of supplies, notebooks, colored pens. d. Steps taken to teach revision: - Underlining first word in sentences. - Counting words in sentences and paragraphs. - Sentence-combining. 2. Following through--all the time. 3. Group share--early tensions among students--reading out loud. a. Good way for revision to emerge. b. Exchange of peer ideas. c. Clarifying ideas when one hears it aloud. 4. Weakest point--students really don't want to revise and have to fight natural opposition. 5. Strongest point--teacher enthusiastic and eager to stress revision	At first, very dependent on teacher and conferring. Stories are fun to write; revision is always needed to finish it. Wanted writing days even during research paper project. Enjoyed group share--to trigger other ideas and get help from others to revise. Took about six months before revision could be seen as a natural part of their writing process. Weakest point: time, and students do not feel can work at home on writing. Strongest point: freedom to write. "Revision can help you reach the potential of your paper." (3/9/88)
G	Comparison of what said to what did 1. Wanted to try Atwell techniques. 2. Worked at it. 3. Accomplished goals in preplanning writing and revisions. 4. Results are very pleasing from survey of all classes.	